

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

June, 1940

JOHN J. PARRY and MARGARET SCHLAUCH. <i>A Bibliography of Critical Arthurian Literature for the Years 1936-1939.....</i>	129
ARTHUR G. KENNEDY. <i>Recent Trends in English Linguistics</i>	175
DOROTHY F. ATKINSON. <i>Busirane's Castle and Artidon's Cave.....</i>	185
BAIN TATE STEWART. <i>The Psychology of Spenser's Anamnestes</i>	193
LEON HOWARD. <i>Melville's Struggle with the Angel</i>	195
HEINRICH SCHNEIDER. <i>Lessings Gespräche mit Ludwig Timotheus Spittler.....</i>	207
HARCOURT BROWN. <i>Madame Geoffrin and Martin folkes: Six New Letters.....</i>	215
REVIEWS	243

Volume One

Number Two

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON PRESS
SEATTLE

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Edited by

RAY HEFFNER

Managing Editor

DUDLEY D. GRIFFITH

FREDERICK M. PADEFORD

CURTIS C. D. VAIL

HOWARD LEE NOSTRAND

Direct contributions to

Managing Editor, Modern Language Quarterly,

Parrington Hall

University of Washington

Seattle.

Direct business correspondence to

Director of Publications, University of Washington Press

Subscription price \$2.00 per year :: Single copies \$.75

Issued in March, June, September, December

Printed in U.S.A.

Application for entry as second-class matter is
pending at Seattle, Washington.



MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Volume One

June, 1940

Number Two

ARTICLES

- John J. Parry and Margaret Schlauch. A Bibliography of
Critical Arthurian Literature for the Years 1936-1939.... 129
- Arthur G. Kennedy. Recent Trends in English Linguistics.... 175
- Dorothy F. Atkinson. Busirane's Castle and Artidon's Cave.. 185
- Bain Tate Stewart. The Psychology of Spenser's Anamnestes. 193
- Leon Howard. Melville's Struggle with the Angel..... 195
- Heinrich Schneider. Lessings Gespräche mit Ludwig Timotheus
Spittler 207
- Harcourt Brown. Madame Geoffrin and Martin ffolkes: Six
New Letters..... 215

REVIEWS

- Carleton Brown, editor. Religious Lyrics of the XVth Century.
[*Henry A. Person*]..... 243
- Robert Hunter West. The Invisible World: A Study of
Pneumatology in Elizabethan Drama. [*Margaret Bushnell*] 245
- Hazelton Spencer. The Art and Life of William Shakespeare.
[*Helen Andrews Kahin*]..... 248
- Thomas Perrin Harrison, Jr., editor. The Pastoral Elegy:
An Anthology. [*Elizabeth Artis Watts*]..... 250
- Donald Cross Bryant. Edmund Burke and His Literary Friends.
[*Donald Cornu*]..... 251
- Lawrence John Zillman. John Keats and the Sonnet Tradition:
A Critical and Comparative Study. [*Edward T. Norris*]. 252
- Bradford Allen Booth, editor. *The Gathering of the West*, by
John Galt. [*Edward Godfrey Cox*]..... 254
- Bernard Smith. Forces in American Criticism. [*E. H. Eby*]. 256
- Bayard Quincy Morgan. A Critical Bibliography of German
Literature in English Translation 1481-1927, With Supplement
Embracing the Years 1928-1935. [*Lawrence M. Price*].. 258

- Hermann Wanderscheck. *Deutsche Dramatik der Gegenwart: Eine Einführung mit ausgewählten Textproben: Mit 12 Dichterbildnissen.* [Edmund E. Miller]..... 260
- Edward Noble Stone, translator. *Three Old French Chronicles of the Crusades (The History of the Holy War, The History of them that took Constantinople, The Chronicle of Reims).*
- Edgar Holmes McNeal, translator. *The Conquest of Constantinople. Translated from the Old French of Robert of Clari.* [Lurline V. Simpson]..... 262
- Norman E. Eliason and Roland C. Davis. *The Effect of Stress Upon Quantity in Dissyllables.* [Horace G. Rahskopf]... 266
- Books Received..... 268

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF CRITICAL ARTHURIAN LITERATURE FOR THE YEARS 1936-1939

Prepared by

JOHN J. PARRY and MARGARET SCHLAUCH¹

This bibliography is a continuation of the two volumes covering the years 1922-1929 and 1930-1935 which were published by the Modern Language Association of America in 1931 and 1936²; its aim is to fill the gap between the second of these volumes and the first of the annual lists which are to appear in the *Modern Language Quarterly*, beginning in June 1941. Limitations of space have made it necessary to omit reference to the shorter reviews and to books and articles which are only remotely connected with the main body of Arthurian studies, but in other respects this bibliography resembles the earlier volumes. The numbering of items is continuous throughout the three parts, and the same alphabetical arrangement and the same abbreviations are used.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADA	Anzeiger für deutsches Altertum
AHR	American Historical Review
AJP	American Journal of Philology
AnglB	Beiblatt zur Anglia
Arch. Camb.	Archæologia Cambrensis
Archiv.	Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen
BBCS	Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies
Beiträge	Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur
BH	Bulletin hispanique
DLZ	Deutsche Literaturzeitung
EHR	English Historical Review
ELH	English Literary History
ES	Englische Studien
E. Studies	English Studies
FF	Forschungen und Fortschritte
GGA	Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen
GRM	Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift
GSLI	Giornale storico della letteratura italiana
JEGP	Journal of English and Germanic Philology
LGRPh	Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie
LTLS	Times Literary Supplement (London)
LZ	Literarisches Zentralblatt
MLN	Modern Language Notes
MLR	Modern Language Review
MP	Modern Philology

¹ For a number of the items the compilers are indebted to Miss Jane D. Harding of the Newberry Library, Chicago.

² These may be obtained from the Treasurer of the Association, price \$1.50 for the two volumes.

<i>Neophil.</i>	Neophilologus
<i>Neuphil. Mit.</i>	Neuphilologische Mitteilungen
<i>N & Q</i>	Notes and Queries
<i>PMLA</i>	Publications of the Modern Language Association of America
<i>PQ</i>	Philological Quarterly
<i>Rev. belge</i>	Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire
<i>RCHL</i>	Revue critique d'histoire et de littérature
<i>RES</i>	Review of English Studies
<i>RFE</i>	Revista de Filología española
<i>RR</i>	Romanic Review
<i>SP</i>	Studies in Philology
<i>TNTL</i>	Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde
<i>YWES</i>	The Year's Work in English Studies
<i>YWMLS</i>	The Year's Work in Modern Language Studies
<i>ZCPH</i>	Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie
<i>ZDA</i>	Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum
<i>ZDPH</i>	Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie
<i>ZFSL</i>	Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur
<i>ZRPh</i>	Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie

1775. A., G.E.P. "The Encaverned Barbarossa." [Parallel to Arthur.] *N & Q*, CLXXVII (1939), 121.

See also O. F. Babler and Frederic Connett White.

1776. A., L. E. "Sir Gawain and the Green Knight and Pearl." *N & Q*, CLXX (1936), 27.

1777. Ackermann, A. S. E. "King Alfred in the Danish Camp." [Similar story in Geoffrey.] *N & Q*, CLXXVII (1939), 137.

1778. Adams, Robert D. W. *A Tristan Bibliography*. Univ. of Southern California diss., 1935.

1779. Adolf, Helene. "Der Eingang zu Wolframs Parzival." *Neophil.*, xxii (1937), 110-120; 171-185.

1780. Allen, D. C. "Arthur's Diamond Shield in the *Faerie Queene*." *JEGP*, xxxvi (1937), 234-243.

696. Amoretti, Giovanni Vittorio. *Il "Tristan" di Gottfried von Strassburg*. Pisa, 1934. Published also in Heidelberg by Weiss.

Rev. by O. Behaghel in *LGRPh*, LVII (1936), 377; by Friedrich Ranke in *ADA*, LV (1936), 84-85.

1781. van den Adel, Gerrit. *Die Margaretalegende in ihren mittelalterlichen Versionen*. [Includes Hartmann and Wolfram.] Amsterdam diss. Groningen: Noordhoff, 1933.

1782. Anderson, M. D. *The Medieval Carver*. [Contains material on the legends of Tristan and Isolt and Sir Yvain.] Cambridge: University Press, 1935.

1783. Angyal, Andreas. "Ein Beitrag zur Parzival-Motivgeschichte." *Egyetemes Philologiai Közlöny (Archivum Philologicum)*, LXII (1938), 104-108.

1784. Anonymous. "Wolfram von Eschenbach der Snger der Gralssage." *Westdeutsche Arbeiterzeitung*, xxxvi (July 21, 1936).

1785. Arnold, Ivor D. O. "Malory's Story of Arthur's Roman Campaign." [Comment on Vorontzoff.] *Medium vum*, vii (1938), 74-75.

1786. ——— (ed.). *Le Roman de Brut de Wace*. (Societ des anciens textes franais.) Paris: Droz, 1938.

See Carin Fahlin, and Nitze and Taylor.

1787. Aurner, Nellie Slayton. *Malory: An Introduction to the Morte D'Arthur*. New York: Nelson, 1938.

1788. Axhausen, Kte. *Die Theorien ber den Ursprung der provenzalischen Lyrik*. Marburg diss. Dsseldorf: Nolte, 1937.

Rev. by William J. Entwistle in *MLR*, xxxiii (1938), 89-92; by Walther Suchier in *DLZ*, lxi (1938), 1680-1682; by A. Lngfors in *Neuphil. Mit.*, xl (1939), 339-342.

1789. Baader, Th. "Wort- und Sacherklrungen zur keltischen Tristansage." *Tijdschrift voor Taal en Letteren*, xxvi (1938), 9-22.

1790. Babillot, F. "Le Libro de Buen Amor de l'Archprtre de Hita." [Parallelism with medieval Arts of Love.] *BH*, xxxvi (1934), 500-502.

1791. Babler, O. F. "The Encaverned Barbarossa." *N & Q*, clxxvii (1939), 14-15.

See also G.E.P.A. and Frederic Connett White.

1792. Baesecke, Georg. "Wolfram von Eschenbach im Odenwald." *Deutsche Rundschau*, cclix (1939), 179-184.

1793. Bumer, Gertrude. *Wolfram von Eschenbach*. (Die Dichter der Deutschen, Folge 2.) Stuttgart: Cotta, [1938].

1794. Baier, Clair. *Der Bauer in der Dichtung des Strickers: Eine Literar-historische Untersuchung*. [Includes chapter on "Die hfische Zeit," Hartmann, Wolfram, Gottfried.] Tbingen: Becht, [1938?].

1795. Baker, Sister Imogene. *The King's Household in the Arthurian Court from Geoffrey of Monmouth to Malory*. Catholic Univ. diss. Washington: Catholic University, 1937.

1796. Banfi-Malaguzzi, Daria. *Storia di Messer Tristano e dei buoni cavalieri di Bretagna*. Milano: Aples, 1927.

1797. Barbi, Michele. "Dante e il mistero del Graal." [Comment on Evola.] *Studi Danteschi*, xxii (1938), 197-198.

1798. Bauer, Ruth. *Studien zum Wigalois des Wirnt von Gravenberg*. (Germanische Studien, Heft 180.) Berlin: Ebering, 1936.

1799. B[aumgart], W. "Der deutsche Ritter." [Comment on Naumann and Keferstein.] *Geistige Arbeit*, v, i (1938), 4.

1800. Bauss, Hermann. *Studien zum Liebesdialog in der höfischen Epik*. Marburg diss. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1938.

1801. Bayley, A. R. "The Five Wounds." [Sir Gawain.] *N & Q*, CLXXI (1936), 266.

See also L. R. M. Strachan and Edward J. G. Forse.

1802. Becher, H. "Der ewige Parzival." *Stimmen der Zeit*, CXXXIII (1938), 368-379.

759. Becker, Ph. Aug. *Der gepaarte Achtsilber in der französischen Dichtung*, 1934. Reprinted, Halle: Niemeyer, 1937.

Additional reviews by Hans Spanke in *LGRPh*, LVII (1936), 449-455; by Kurt Wais in *ZRPh*, LVIII (1938), 574-586; by Franz Rauhut in *DLZ*, LX (1939), 409-411.

760. ——— "Von den Erzählern neben und nach Chrestien de Troyes." Continued in *ZRPh*, LVI (1936), 241-274. Reprinted, Halle: Niemeyer, 1937.

1803. Beckmann, Bernhard. *Sprachliche und textkritische Untersuchungen zu Johann von Würzburg*. Berlin diss., 1937.

760a. Beekman, P. H. (Not Beckmann.) *Jean Renart and His Writings*. 1935.

Rev. by Bateman Edwards in *MLN*, LI (1936), 473-475.

1804. Bell, Alexander. "Maistre Geffrei Gaimar." *Medium Ævum*, VII (1938), 184-198.

1804a. ——— "The Munich *Brut* and the *Estoire des Bretons*." *MLR*, XXXIV (1939), 321-354.

1805. Bell, H. Idris. "The Welsh MSS in the British Museum." *Trans. Hon. Soc. Cymmrodorion*, 1936 [1937], 15-40.

1806. Bennett, R. E. "Arthur and Gorlagon, the Dutch Lance-lot, and St. Kentigern," *Speculum*, XII (1938), 68-75.

1807. Bergin, Osborn, and Best, R. I. "Tochmarc Étaíne." [Text and translation.] *Eriu*, XII (1938), 137-196.

Berr, Henri. See Louis Reau.

1808. Bertelt, Elfriede. *Gewandschilderungen in der erzählenden höfischen Dichtung des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts*. Münster diss. Emsdetten: Lechte, 1936.

1809. Bertoni, Giulio. *Cantari di Tristano*. Modena: Società tipografica Modenese editrice, 1937.

Rev. by A. Jeanroy in *Romania*, LXV (1939), 141-142.

——— See M. Galasso.

Best, R. I. See Osborn Bergin.

1810. Bink, H. "Artushöfe des Ordenslandes." *Ostdeutsche Monatshefte*, xviii (1938), 765-767.

1811. Blanco, M. García. "Sobre los nombres épicos." [Arturus recorded as man's name in 1200.] *RFE*, xxi (1934), 279-281.

1812. Bodensohn, Heinz. *Die Festschilderung in der mittelhochdeutschen Dichtung*. Frankfurt diss. (Forschung zur deutschen Sprache und Dichtung, Heft 9.) Münster: Aschendorff, 1937.

Rev. by Kurt Herbert Halbach in *DLZ*, lx (1939), 589-591.

1813. Boesch, Bruno. *Die Kunstanschauung in der mittelhochdeutschen Dichtung von der Blütezeit bis zum Meistergesang*. Bern diss. Bern & Leipzig: Haupt, 1936.

Rev. by Heinz Otto Burger in *DLZ*, lxx (1938), 599-604.

1814. Bollinger, Katharina. *Das Tragische im höfischen Epos*. Bonn diss., 1939. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1938 (Ausg. 1939).

1815. Bond, Frederick Bligh. *The Mystery of Glaston and her Immortal Traditions*. London: Glastonbury Publications, 1938. See *LTLS*, June 18, 1938, p. 421.

1816. ———. "Glastonbury Abbey." Reprinted from *Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries*, June, 1938.

Bork, Hans. See Konrad Burdach.

1817. Boyd, James. *Ulrich Fûetrer's "Parzival": Material and Sources*. (*Medium Ævum* Monographs, I) Vol. I. Oxford: Blackwell, 1936.

Rev. by Eduard Hartl in *DLZ*, lxx (1938), 1346-1349; by Friedrich Panzer in *Est*, lxxii (1937), 99-101; by Margaret F. Richey in *MLR*, xxxii (1937), 323-325; in *Dichtung und Volkstum*, xxxix (1938), 254-260; by Friedrich Ranke in *ZDPv*, lxiv (1939), 117-118. See also F. P. Pickering in *Leeds Studies*, v (1936), 93-95, and Nitze and Taylor.

1818. Bramwell, James. *Lost Atlantis*. London: Cobden-Sanderson; and New York: Harper, 1937.

1819. Braun, Hans Wilhelm. "Ein Rennerbruchstück aus Friedberg i.H." *ADA*, lxxv (1938), 172.

1820. Breillat, Pierre. "Une traduction italienne de *La Morte le Roi Artu*." *Arch. Rom.*, xxi (1937), 437-469.

1821. ———. "La Quête du Saint Graal en Italie." Extrait des *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire publiés par l'École française de Rome*, liv (1937), 262-300.

1822. ———. "Le Manuscrit français palatin 556: *La Tavola Rotonda* et la liturgie du Graal." *Ibid.*, lv (1938).

1823. Brereton, Georgine (ed.). *Des Grantz Geanz*. [Introduction to *Brute Chronicle*.] Oxford: Blackwell (for the Society for the study of Medieval Languages and Literature), 1937.

Rev. by F. J. Tanqueray in *Medium Ævum*, vii (1938), 132-134; by M. K. Pope in *MLR*, xxxiii (1938), 441-442; by Claude Cuénot in *ZRPh*, LVIII (1938), 711-716.

——— See M. Dominica Legge.

1824. Brinkmann, Hennig. "Die epische Dichtung des deutschen Rittertums." [Wolfram, Hartmann.] *Zeit. für deutsche Bildung*, xi (1937), 334-346.

1825. Brodeur, Arthur G. *Arthur, Dux Bellorum*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1939. Reprinted from Univ. of Calif. Pub. in English, III, vii (1939), 237-284.

816. Brugger, E. "Kritische Bemerkungen zu Lucy Allen Paton's Ausgabe der *Prophecies Merlin* des Maistre Richart d'Irlande: Fortsetzung und Schluss." *ZFSL*, LX (1936), 213-223.

1826. ——— "Die Komposition der *Prophecies Merlin* des Maistre Richart d'Irlande und die Verfasserfrage." *Arch. Rom.*, xx (1936), 359-448.

1827. ——— "Verbesserungen zum Text und Ergänzungen zu den Varianten der Ausgabe der *Prophecies Merlin* des Maistre Richart d'Irlande." *ZRPh*, LVI (1936), 563-603.

1828. ——— "Das arthurische Material in der *Prophecies Merlin* des Meisters Richart d'Irlande—mit einem Anhang über die Verbreitung der P.M." *ZFSL*, LXI (1937), 321-362; LXII (1938), 40-73.

1829. Burdach, Konrad. *Der Gral: Forschungen über seinen Ursprung und seinen Zusammenhang mit der Longinuslegende*. [Published after his death by Hans Bork.] (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte, 14.) Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1938.

Rev. by Roger Sherman Loomis in *Ger. Rev.*, xiv (1939), 221-222.

1830. Buttke, H. *Studien über Armut und Reichtum in der mittelhochdeutschen Dichtung*. Bonn diss. Würzburg: Mayr, 1938.

1831. Caflisch-Einicher, Emma. *Die lateinischen Elemente in der mittelhochdeutschen Epik des 13. Jahrhunderts*. München diss. (Prager deutsche Studien, Heft 47.) Reichenberg: Kraus, 1936.

1832. Capasso, A. *Tre saggi sulla poesia italiana del Rinascimento*. [Boiardo, Lorenzo, Ariosto.] Genova: Emiliano degli Orfini, 1939.

1833. Capone, Stefano. "Eliduc," *Storia d'amore medievale*. . . . Napoli: Arti grafiche D. Amodio, 1939.

1834. Carducci, Giosue. *Edizione Nazionale delle Opere*. Bologna: Zanichell. [Vol. XIII (1936) contains a new essay, "Della vita e delle opere di Matteo Maria Boiardo."]

1835. Carman, J. Neale. *The Relationship of the "Perlesvaus" and the "Queste del Saint Graal."* (Univ. of Kansas Humanistic Studies, v, No. 4, July, 1936.) Lawrence, Kan.: Univ. of Kansas Dept. of Journalism Press, 1936.

Rev. by Roger Sherman Loomis in *RR*, xxviii (1937), 351-355; by Werner Mulert in *ZRPh*, LVIII (1938), 734-735.

1836. ———. "The Sword Withdrawal in Robert de Boron's *Merlin* and in the *Queste del Saint Graal*." *PMLA*, LIII (1938), 593-595.

1837. Carter, Barbara Barclay. "Dante and the Holy Grail." *Contemp. Rev.*, CLIII (1938), 62-71.

1838. Chotzen, Th. M. "Bisclaveret." *Études celtiques*, II, 3 (1937), 33-44.

1839. Claassen, A. H. "Die Vorlage des Prosaromans von Tristrant und Isalde." *Neophil.*, xxii (1937), 33-37.

1840. Clark, Mary Alice. *Edwin Arlington Robinson's Treatment of the Tristram-Isolt Legend*. [Includes Malory, Arnold, Tennyson, Swinburne.] Univ. of Illinois M.A. thesis, 1937 [not printed].

1841. Cohen, Gustave. *Marie de France: Extrait du roman courtois au XII^e siècle*. (Les Cours de Sorbonne.) Paris: Centre de document. universitaire, 1935.

1842. ———. *Chrestien de Troyes: Œuvres Choiesies*. Avec une notice biographique, une notice historique et littéraire, des notes explicatives, des jugements, un questionnaire et des sujets de devoirs. Paris: Larousse, 1936.

1843. Colgrave, Bertram. "Sir Gawayne's Green Chapel." (With additional note by O. G. S. C[rawford].) *Antiquity*, xii (1938), 351-353.

1844. Collingwood, R. G. and Myres, J. N. L. *Roman Britain and the English Settlements*. (The Oxford History of England, Vol. I.) Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. Second Edition, 1937.

Rev. by Peter Hunter Blair in *EHR*, LII (1937), 683-687; by Alois Brandl in *DLZ*, LVIII (1937), 968-972; by Kemp Malone in *MLN*, LIII (1938), 220-222; by P.K.B.R. in *Antiquaries Journal*, xvii (1937), 451-453; by I. A. Richmond in *Journal of Brit. Archaeological Assn.* 3 Ser. II (1937), 197-200; by R. E. M. Wheeler in *Journal of Roman Studies*, xxix (1939), 87-93.

1845. Cordes, Gerhard. *Zur Sprache Eilhards von Oberg*. (Hansische Forschungen. Arbeiten zur germ. Phil., Heft 1.) Hamburg: Wachholtz, 1939.

1846. C[rawford], O. G. S. A note on Catterick, giving the substance of a letter from Ifor Williams. [Supplement to Kenneth Jackson on the Gododdin.] *Antiquity*, XIII (1939), 34.

1847. Crawford, O. G. S. "Coludes Burh." *Antiquity*, VIII (1934), 202-204.

——— See Bertram Colgrave.

1848. Cruttwell, Robert W. "The Initiation Pattern and the Grail." *Folk-Lore*, XLIX (1938), 244-257.

1849. Cucuel, Ernst. *Die Eingangsbücher des Parzival*. Heidelberg diss. (Deutsche Forschungen, Bd. 30.) Frankfurt: Diesterweg, 1937.

Rev. by W. Golther in *LGRPh*, LIX (1938), 378-379.

1850. Cunliffe, J. W. *England in Picture, Song, and Story*. [Chapter on King Arthur in the West.] New York: Appleton-Century, 1936.

1851. Curtius, E. R. "Zur Literarästhetik des Mittelalters." [Comment on Glunz.] *ZRPh*, LVIII (1938), 1-50.

1852. Czerny, Johann. "Die Versform in Richard Wagner's *Tristan und Isolde*." *Bayreuther Blätter*, LIX (1936), 183-201; LX (1937), 96-102.

1853. D., C. "King Richard and King Arthur." *N & Q*, CLXX (1936), 245.

1854. Dal, Ingerid. "German. *Brûn* als Epitheton von Waffen." [Includes Arthurian examples.] *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap*, IX (1938), 219-230.

1855. Daniëls, J[oaannes] C[ornel]. *Wolframs "Parzival," S. Johannes der Evangelist und Abraham Bar Chija*. Mit einem Geleitwort von Th. Baader. Nijmegen diss. (Disquisitiones Carolinae, I, 11.) Nijmegen: Centrale Drukkerij, 1937.

Rev. by Alexander H. Krappe in *Speculum*, XIV (1939), 377-378.

1856. Davies, Constance. "*Sir Orfeo* and *De Nugis*." [Reference to Loomis.] *MLN*, LI (1936), 492.

1857. ——— "Notes on the Sources of *Sir Orfeo*." *MLR*, XXXI (1936), 354-357.

1858. Davis, J. C. *Use of the Subjunctive and the Conditional in the "Perlesvaus"*. Part of Univ. of Chicago diss., 1938 (litho-typed).

1859. Dean, F. R. "The Grail Legend." *Papers of the Manchester Literary Club*, LXI (1936), 161-182.

1860. Delpino, Marcella. "Elementi celtici ed elementi classici nel *Tristan* di Thomas." *Arch. Rom.*, XXIII (1939), 312-336.

894. Dijksterhuis, A. *Thomas und Gottfried*. 1935.

Rev. by Wolfgang Golther in *LGRPh*, LVII (1936), 376-377; by Arthur Witte in *DLZ*, LVIII (1937), 1851-1855.

1861. Doble, Gilbert H. *S. Gerent, A Cornish Saint*. (Cornish Saints Series, No. 41.) The Author: Wendron Vicarage, Helston, Cornwall, 1938.

1861a. Dobson, C. C. "Did Our Lord visit Britain as they say in Cornwall and Somerset?" Glastonbury: *Central Somerset Gazette*, 1936.

1862. Dornbush, R. "Wagner and the Iseult Legend." *Musician*, LIV (1939), 124ff.

1863. Draak, A. M. E. *Onderzoekingen over de Roman van Walewein*. Amsterdam diss. (Nederl. Bijdragen op het Gebied van Germaansche Philol., 8.) Haarlem: Tjeenk Willink & Zoon, and Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger, 1936.

Rev. by Th. H. d'Agremond in *De Nieuwe Taalgids*, XXXIII, iv (1937), 181-184; by J. A. N. Knuttel in *TNTL*, LVI (1937), 316-319; by Th. M. Chotzen in *Museum*, XLVI (1939), 93-95.

1864. Drube, Herbert. "Die germanischen Wurzeln von Wolframs *Parzival*." *Zeit. für deutsche Bildung*, xv (1939), 49-61.

1865. Dumas, André. *Anthologie des poètes français du X^e au XVI^e siècle*. [Includes Arthurian romances.] Coll. Pallas. Paris: Delagrave, 1935.

912. Dyggve, Holgar Peterson. *Onomastique des trouvères*. 1934.

Rev. by Arthur Långfors in *ZFSL*, LXII (1939), 461-476; by H. S. in *Studi Medievali*, VIII (1935), 126-135.

1866. Eckert, Flora. *Cataloguing Entries for Anonymous Anglo-Saxon Poetry, Middle English Metrical Romances, Tales and Chronicles, and Early English Drama*. [Includes Arthurian romances.] Univ. of Illinois diss. [not printed].

1867. van Eerden, Albert. *Eine Beschreibung der "Parzival" HS. G. und anderer Stücke des Codex Germanicus 6 der Hamburger Staats- und Univ. Bibl.* (Ottendorfer Memorial Series of German Monographs, 24.) New York Univ., 1938 [lithographed].

1868. Ehrentreich, A. "Neue Variationen zum Tristanthema." *ESL*, LXX (1936), 431-432.

922. Eisen, Gustavus A. *The Great Chalice of Antioch*. 1933.

Rev. by Stanley Casson in *Antiquity*, XI (1937), 124-125.

1869. Emmanuel, Alex. *La conquête du Graal*. Paris: Maisonneuve, 1939.

1870. Emmel, Hildegard. *Das Verhältnis von êre und triuwe im "Nibelungenlied" und bei Hartmann und Wolfram*. Frankfurt diss. (Frankfurter Quellen und Forschungen zur germanischen und romanischen Philologie, Heft 44.) Frankfurt: Diesterweg, 1936.

1871. Engel, Wilhelm. *Das älteste Inventar d. Wildenberg*. (Mitteilungen des Wolfram von Eschenbach-Bundes, Heft 4.) Amorbach: Wildenbergverlag, 1938.

1872. Ericson, Eston Everett. "'Reaving the Dead' in the Age of Chivalry." [Includes Arthurian references.] *MLN*, LII (1937), 353-355.

1873. Errante, Vincenzo. "Il *Tristano e Isotta* di Riccardo Wagner. Nota critica introduttiva e versione ritmica del 2 e 3 atto." *Studi Germanici*, II (1937), 479-503.

1874. Evans, R. Wallis. "Trem ar y Cywydd Brud." [Influence of Geoffrey of Monmouth upon political prophecy.] Pp. 149-163 of *Harlech Studies presented to Dr. Thomas Jones*, C. H. Cardiff: Univ. of Wales Press Board, 1938.

1875. ———. "Darogannau." [One, "Proffwydoliaeth y Wennol," attributed to Merddin.] *BBCS*, IX (1939), 314-319.

1876. ———. "Tri Cerdd Ddarogan." [One, "O hen lyfr Merddin"; others mention Arthur and Merddin.] *BBCS*, X (1939), 44-53.

1877. Everett, Dorothy. "The Relationship of Chrestre's *Launfal* and *Lybeaus Desconus*." *Medium Ævum*, VII (1938), 29-49.

1878. Evola, J. *Il mistero del Graal e la tradizione ghibellina dell'impero*. (Study Religiosi ed Esoterici.) Bari: Laterza, 1937. Rev. by René Herval in *Rev. des ét. ital.*, II (1937), 385-386. See also Michele Barbi.

1879. ———. "Gralsmysterium und Kaisergedank." *Geist der Zeit*, XVII, III (1939).

1880. Ewert, A. (ed.). *The "Romance of Tristan" by Béroul*. Vol. I. Introduction, Text, Variants, Glossary, Index. Oxford: Blackwell, 1939.

1881. Eyl, Meta. "Wolfram von Eschenbach und das Christentum." *Aufgaben und Ziele*, III (1936), 7-10.

1882. F., J. R. "The Five Wounds." *N & Q*, CLXXI (1936), 335-336. See A. R. Bailey and Edward J. G. Forse.

1883. Fahlin, Carin. "Quelques remarques sur l'édition du *Roman de Brut* de Wace publiée par Ivor Arnold." *Studia Neophilologica*, XI (1939), 85-100.

1884. Faral, Edmond. "Le Manuscrit 511 du Hunterian Museum." [Ref. to Hammer and Douai 880 which includes Geoffrey of Monmouth.] *Studi Medievali*, ix (1936), 18-121.

1885. Farnham, Willard. *The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy*. [Includes chapters on "The Mirror for Magistrates," and "The Progeny of the Mirror."] Berkeley: Univ. of California Press; and London: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1936.

1886. Fechter, Werner. *Das Publikum der mittelhochdeutschen Dichtung*. (Deutsche Forschungen, Bd. 28.) Frankfurt: Diesterweg, 1935.

Rev. by Wieland Schmidt in *ADA*, lvi (1937), 24-28.

1887. Fiebig, Werner. *Das "Livre d'Enanchet" nach der einzigen Handschrift 2585 der Wiener Nationalbibliothek*. Berlin diss. (Berliner Beiträge zur rom. Philologie, Bd. 3, Hefte 3/4.) Jena & Leipzig: Gronau, 1938.

Rev. by Werner Mulerdt in *DLZ*, lx (1939), 1129-1130; by G. Bertoni in *GSLI*, cxiii (1939), 142-143.

1888. Fink, Reinhard. *Hartmann von Aue: Epische Dichtungen*. [*Erec*, *Gregorius*, *Heinrich*, *Iwein* in modern prose.] Jena: Diederich, 1939.

1889. ———. "Der Artusstoff in der deutschen Dichtung des Mittelalters." *Zeit. für deutsche Geisteswissenschaft*, ii (1939), 118-137.

1890. Firth, Charles. *Essays Historical and Literary*. [Includes "Milton as an Historian."] Oxford: Univ. Press, 1938.

1891. Fisher, Fay. *Narrative Art in Medieval Romances*. Cleveland: Western Reserve Univ. Press, 1939.

1892. Fletcher, Harris. "The First Edition of Milton's *History of Britain*." [Comment on Krapp's edition.] *JEGP*, xxxv (1936), 405-414.

1893. Forse, Edward J. G. "The Five Wounds," *N & Q*, clxxi (1936), 300-301. See J. R. F. and A. R. Bayley.

1893a. Forte, Mario. "L'Enanchet e la Rota Veneris." [Part III based on Andreas Capellanus.] *Arch. Rom.*, xxii (1938), 392-398.

1894. Fourquet, J. "Zobel von Connelant." [*Erec*, v. 2000ff.] *ZDA*, lxxi (1934), 268.

1895. ———. *Wolfram von Eschenbach et le "Conte del Graal": Les divergences de la tradition du "Conte del Graal" de Chrétien et leur importance pour l'explication du "Parzival"*. (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, Fasc. 87.) Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1938.

1896. Frappier, Jean. *Étude sur "La Morte le roi Artu," roman du XIII^e siècle. Dernière partie du "Lancelot" en Prose.* Paris diss. Paris: Droz, 1936.

Rev. by W. H. Trethewey in *ZRPh*, LVIII (1938), 698-710. See also next item.

1897. ———. *"La Morte le roi Artu": roman du XIII^e siècle. Étude Critique.* Paris: Droz, 1936.

Both items reviewed by Ferdinand Lot in *Romania*, LXIV (1938), 111-130; by J. Vendryes in *Études celtiques*, II, 3 (1937), 144-148; by M. Wilmette in *Moyen âge*, XLVIII (1938), 205-210; by Stefan Hofer in *LGRPh*, LX (1939), 494-500.

1898. French, J. Milton. "Milton's Annotated Copy of Gildas." *Harvard St. and Notes in Phil. and Lit.*, xx (1938), 75-80.

1899. Frenzen, Wilhelm. *Klagebilder und Klagegebärden in der deutschen Dichtung des höfischen Mittelalters.* (Bonner Beiträge zur deu. Philologie, Heft 1.) [Includes Gottfried, Wolfram, Konrad v. Würzburg.] Würzburg: Triltsch, 1938.

Rev. by Kurt H. Halbach in *DLZ*, LX (1939), 1275-1278.

1900. Fritz, Leonore. *Die Steigerungsadverbia in den Denkmälern der mhd. Literatur von der Blütezeit bis zum 15. Jh.* [Includes Veldeke, Hartmann, Wolfram and Gottfried.] München diss. München: Höfling, 1934.

1901. Fuehrer, Sister Mary Rosina. *A Study of the Relation of the Dutch "Lancelot" and the Flemish "Percheval" Fragments to the Manuscripts of Chrétien's "Conte Del Graal."* Catholic Univ. diss. Cath. Univ. Studies in German, xiv. Washington, 1939.

1902. Galasso, M. *Il Tristano Corsiniano.* Pref. di G. Bertoni. Cassino: Le Fonti, 1937.

1903. Gambier, H. *Littérature française: Les trois grands siècles du moyen âge, XI^e, XII^e, XIII^e.* Treviso: Longo e Zoppeli, 1936.

1904. Gantscheff, Gantscho. *Das Verbum in Wolframs "Titulrel": Ein Beitrag zu einem Wolframwörterbuch.* Halle: Niemeyer, 1937.

Rev. by Hans-Friedrich Rosenfeld in *Archiv*, CLXXIV (1938), 209-210; by O. Sexauer in *LGRPh*, LX (1939), 306-307. See also Nitze and Taylor.

1905. Gaussen, Dr. C. "En montant vers Montsegur." [Connects Montsegur with Montsalvat and the Grail.] *Mémoires de l'Académie de Vaucluse*, xxxv (1935), 139-160.

1906. Gerould, Gordon H. "The Gawain Poet and Dante." *PMLA*, LI (1936), 31-36.

1907. Ghéon, Henri. *La Quête heroïque du Graal.* Paris: Blot, 1938.

Rev. by René Salomé in *Études*, CCXXXVII (1938), 92-96.

1908. Gill, W. Walter. "The Wonders of the Isle of Man." [Nennius.] *Folk-Lore*, L (1939), 33-44.

1909. Gilman, Lawrence. *Wagner's Operas*. [Chapters on *Lohengrin*, *Tristan and Isolde*, and *Parsifal*.] New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1937.

1910. Glaser, Helmut. *Schreibsystem und Mundart der "Parzival"* Handschrift G_u der Wiener National-Bibliothek. Wien diss., 1934.

1911. Glunz, H[ans] H. *Die Literarästhetik des europäischen Mittelalters. Wolfram-Rosenroman-Chaucer-Dante*. (Das Abendland: Forschungen zur Geschichte europäischen Geisteslebens, Bd. 2.) Bochum-Langendreer: Pöppinghaus, 1937.

Rev. by Heinz Otto Burger in *DLZ*, LIX (1938), 600-604; by B. E. C. Davis in *Medium Ævum*, VII (1938), 151-153; by Mario Fubini in *Studi Danteschi*, XXII (1938), 123-128; by R. Metz in *AnglB*, XLVIII (1937), 290-297; by Gilbert Trathnigg in *DLZ*, LIX (1938), 600-604; by Walther Rehm in *ZDPPh*, LXIV (1939), 73-79; by Rudolf Hittmair in *ESt*, LXXIII (1938), 72-83; by Mario Praz in *Eng. Studies*, XXI (1939), 166-169; by Karl Hammerle in *Archiv*, CLXXVI (1939), 85-92. See also E. R. Curtius.

1912. Goern, H. *Das Ehebild im deutschen Mittelalter*. Halle: Akademischer Verlag, [1937?].

1913. Goetz, Gertrud. *Die Idee der sozialen Nothilfe in der Dichtung Wolframs von Eschenbach*. Freiburg diss. Schramberg: Gatzert & Hahn, 1936.

1914. Golther, Wolfgang. "Der Schwanritter und der Gralsritter." *Bayreuther Blätter*, LIX (1936), 123-129.

1915. ———. "Der älteste franz. Tristanroman." *Der Westfälische Erzieher*, VI, No. 5.

1916. Gordon, E. V. and Vinaver, E. "New Light on the Text of the alliterative *Morte Arthure*." [From the Winchester MS of Malory.] *Medium Ævum*, VI (1937), 81-98.

1917. Graves, Philip P. "Wallop, Guollopum, and Catguoloph." *Antiquity*, XII (1938), 474-476.

1918. Green, Zaidee E. "Swooning in the *Faerie Queene*." [Arthurian references.] *SP*, XXXIV (1937), 126-133.

1919. Griffiths, Margaret Enid. *Early Vaticination in Welsh with English Parallels*. Edited by Professor T. Gwynn Jones. Cardiff: Univ. of Wales Press Board; and London: Milford, 1937.

Rev. by H. I. Bell in *History*, XXIII (1938), 65-66; by Edgar C. Knowlton in *Speculum*, XIII (1938), 467-468.

1920. Grigson, G. "King Arthur and Tristan in the West," *Listener*, Sept. 9, 1936, pp. 447-479.

1764. Grimes, Margaret. "Le Lay du Trot," *RR*, xxvi (1934), 313-321. Wrongly ascribed to Donato Zinno.
1921. Grönbärj, Herman. *Sampo: Sankt Gral*. Helsingfors, 1935. See *Mém. de la Soc. Néophil. de Helsinki*, xiii (1939), 404.
1922. Gross, Hedwig. *Hartmanns Büchlein, dargestellt in seiner psychologischen, ethischen, und theologischen Bezogenheit auf das Gesamtwerk des Dichters*. Bonn diss. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1937.
1923. Grundmann, Herbert. "Die Frauen und die Literatur im Mittelalter." *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, xxvi (1936), 129-161.
1924. Gudde, Erwin G. *Social Conflicts in Medieval German Poetry*. [Includes Arthurian material.] (Univ. of California Pub. in Modern Phil., 18.) Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1934.
1925. Haberly, Loyd. *Medieval English Paving Tiles*. Illustrated by the Author. Oxford: Blackwell, 1937.
1926. Halbach, K. H. *Französentum und Deutschtum in höfischer Dichtung des Stauferzeitalters. Hartmann von Aue und Crestien de Troyes, Iwein-Yvain*. (Neue deutsche Forschungen, Abt. Dt. Philol., Bd. 7.) Berlin: Juncker & Dünhaupt, 1939.
1040. van Hamel, A. G. "Partholon." For correction see *Études celtiques*, i (1936), 247. See also R. Thurneysen.
1042. ———. *Aspects of Celtic Mythology*. 1934.
Rev. by J. Vendryes in *Études celtiques*, i, 2 (1936), 329-331.
1927. ———. "The Old Norse Version of the *Historia Regum Britanniae* and the Text of Geoffrey of Monmouth." *Études celtiques*, i (1936), 197-247.
1928. Hammer, Jacob. "The Poetry of Johannes Beverus with extracts from his *Tractatus de Bruto Abbreviato*." *MP*, xxxiv (1936), 119-132.
1929. ———. "A reference to Foppish Coiffures in Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Prophetia Merlini*." *Speculum*, xii (1937), 503-508.
1930. ———. "Une version métrique de l'*Historia Regum Britanniae* de Geoffrey de Monmouth." *Latomus*, ii (1938), 131-151.
1931. Harding, Jane D. *The Arthurian Legend, a Check List of Books in the Newberry Library*. Supplement. Chicago: The Newberry Library, 1938. [The original check list published in 1933.]
1932. Hartl, Eduard. "Anfortas; die Möglichkeiten zur Darstellung des Tragischen im Mittelalter." *Geistige Arbeit*, v, i (1938), 3-4.

1933. ———. "Zu Ulrich Füetters *Parzival*." [Comment on Boyd.] *ADA*, LXXV (1938), 199-200.

1934. Hartsen, M[aria] J[acota]. *Der Zwiespalt in Gottfrieds "Tristan" und die Einheit der ritterlich-höfischen Kultur*. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger, 1938.

1935. Hatto, A. T. "Moritz von Craon." [Arthurian parallels.] *London Medieval Studies*, I, ii (1938), 285-304.

1936. Hay, Denys. "The Manuscript of Polydore Vergil's *Anglica Historia*." *EHR*, LIV (1939), 240-251.

1937. Heather, P. J. "Laȝamon's *Brut*." *Folk-Lore*, XLVIII (1937), 339-365.

1938. Hein, Alfred. *Walther von der Vogelweide im Urteil der Jahrhunderte*. [Includes Wolfram and Gottfried.] Griefswald diss., 1934.

1939. Hempel, [?]. "Meister Gotfrids und R. Wagner's *Tristan*." *Der Westfälische Erzieher*, VI, No. 5.

1940. Hibernicus. "Famous Weapons." [Includes Arthur's sword, spear, and shield, and Gawaine's sword.] *N & Q*, CLXXIV (1938), 392.

1076. Hilka, Alfons. *Der Percevalroman*. 1932.

Rev. by Hermann Breuer in *ZRPh*, LVII (1937), 636-642.

1941. Hodgkin, R. H. *A History of the Anglo-Saxons*. [Includes Arthurian material.] 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935.

Rev. by A. Brandl in *Archiv*, CLXXII (1937), 81-84; by Enröde Frigyes in *Egyetemes Philologiae Közlöny*, LXI (1937), 298-300; by F. P. Magoun, Jr. in *MLN*, LII (1937), 510-515; by B. J. Whiting in *Speculum*, XII (1937), 122-124; by R. M. Wilson in *Antiquity*, x (1936), 234-236; by Kemp Malone in *Medium Ævum*, VI (1937), 57-60.

1906. Hoepffner, E. *Les Lais de Marie de France*. 1935.

Rev. by Walther Küchler in *LGRPh*, LVIII (1937), 265-268; by Kurt Lewent in *Arch. Rom.*, XXIII (1939), 344-350.

1942. ———. "Marie de France et l'*Enéas*." *Studi Medievali*, v (1932; i.e. 1936), 272-308.

1943. ———. *La "Folie Tristan" d'Oxford, publ. avec commentaire*. Paris: Belles Lettres, 1939.

1944. Hofer, Stefan. "Streitfragen zu Kristian: Eine neue Datierung des *Cligès* und die übrigen Werke Kristians." *ZFSL*, LX (1936), 335-343.

1945. Hofmann, Liselotte. "Der volkskundliche Gehalt der mittelhochdeutschen Epen von 1100 gegen 1250." München diss. Zeulenroda: Sporn, 1939.

1946. Hofstrand, G. *The Seege of Troye: A study of the intertextual relations of the Middle English Romance "The Seege or Batayle of Troye."* [Includes comparison with Arthurian romances.] (Lund Studies in Engl., Vol. 4.) Lund, 1936.

Rev. by G. V. Smithers in *Medium Ævum*, vi (1937), 47-51.

1947. Hogan, Charles Beecher. *A Bibliography of Edwin Arlington Robinson.* New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1936.

Rev. by Theodore G. Ehrsam in *Lib. Q.*, viii (1938), 435-436.

1948. Höhn-Oertel, Hildegard. "Odysseus und Parzival," *Deu. Volkstum*, xv (1933), 467-472.

1949. Holmes, Urban Tigner, Jr. *A History of Old French Literature from the Origins to 1300.* Chapel Hill: Robert Linker; and New York: Crofts, 1937.

Rev. by Percival B. Fay in *Speculum*, xiii (1938), 468-470.

1950. Hooper, A. G. "The Awntyrs off Arthure: Dialect and Authorship." *Leeds Studies in English and Kindred Languages*, iv (1935), 62-74.

1951. Hornstein, Lillian Herlands. *Studies on the "King of Tars."* [Includes Feirefiz in *Parzival*.] New York Univ. diss., 1939 [not printed].

1952. Hotz, Walther. "Wildenberg und Wolfram von Eschenbach." *Geistige Arbeit*, iv, viii (1937), 3-4.

1953. Houck, Margaret E. *Sources of the "Roman de Brut" of Wace, aside from the "Historia Regum Britannia" of Geoffrey of Monmouth.* Univ. of California diss., 1934.

1954. Hübner, A. *Ulrich von Türheim, "Rennewart." Aus der Berliner und Heidelberger Handschrift.* (Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters, Bd. 39.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1938.

1955. Hukanir, Kathryn. "Equine Quartering in *The Owl and the Nightingale*." [Arthurian references.] *PMLA*, li (1937), 935-945.

1956. Hutchings, Gweneth. *Le Roman en prose de "Lancelot du Lac, le Conte de la Charrette."* Paris: Droz, 1938.

Rev. by I.D.O.A. in *Medium Ævum*, viii (1939), 72-74.

1957. Hutson, Arthur. "Geoffrey of Monmouth. I. Brychan and Geoffrey of Monmouth's Ebraucus. II. Welsh Heroes at Arthur's Court." *Trans. Hon. Soc. Cymmrodorion*, 1937 [1938], 361-373.

1958. ———. *The British Latin Sources and the British Personal Names in the "Historia Regum Britannia" of Geoffrey of Monmouth.* Univ. of California diss., 1934.

1959. Ittenbach, Max. "Mittelhochdeutsche Dichtung: Ein Literaturbericht." *Zeit. für deu. Bildung*, xi (1935), 638-646.

1960. Jackson, Kenneth. "The 'Gododdin' of Aneurin." *Antiquity*, xiii (1939), 25-34.

1961. ——— "Nennius and the Twenty-Eight Cities of Britain." *Antiquity*, xii (1938), 44-55.

1962. ——— "Wallop." *Antiquity*, xiii (1939), 105-106. See Philip P. Graves.

1963. Jaggard, William. "The Prophecies of Merlin." *N & Q*, CLXXVII (1939), 251.

1964. Jarman, A. O. H. "Lailoken a Llallogan." [*Vita Merlini*.] *BBCS*, ix (1937), 8-27.

1965. Johnstone, P. K. "Kaw of Pictland." *Antiquity*, xii (1938), 340-341.

1966. ——— "Mons Badonicus and Cerdic of Wessex." *Antiquity*, xiii (1939), 92-96.

1967. Jones, Evan D. "Melwas, Gwenhwyfar, a Chai." *BBCS*, viii (1936), 203-208.

Jones, J. J. See National Library of Wales.

Jones, T. Gwynn. See Margaret Enid Griffiths.

1968. Jones, Thomas. "Attiang." [Ref. to *Brut y Brenhinedd*.] *BBCS*, ix (1939), 38-39.

1969. de Jong, A. J. *Nederlandse Letterkunde. Eerste Deel*. [Includes *Walewein* and *Ridderromans*.] Groningen: Wolters, 1936.

1970. Jungbluth, Günther. *Untersuchungen zu Heinrich von Veldeke*. Heidelberg diss. (Deutsche Forschungen, Bd. 31.) Frankfurt: Diesterweg, 1937.

Rev. by Wolff in *DLZ*, LIX (1938), 952-958; see also J. van Mierlo.

1971. Jungkunz, Antoine Claire. *Menschen darstellung im deutschen höfischen Roman des Barock*. München diss. (Germanische Studien, Heft 190.) Berlin: Ebering, 1937.

1972. Keferstein, Georg. "Die Entwertung der höfischen Gesellschaft im *Tristan* Gottfrieds von Strassburg." *GRM*, xxiv (1936), 421-440.

1973. ——— *Parzivals ethischer Weg: ritterlicher Lebensstil im deutschen Hochmittelalter*. (Literatur und Leben, Bd. 10.) Weimar: Böhlau, 1937.

Rev. by André Moret in *Rev. germ.*, xxix (1938), 182-184; by M. F. Richey in *MLR*, xxxiii (1938), 110-112; by Hellmut Rosenfeld in *Archiv*,

CLXXI (1937), 218-219; by Hugo Suolahti in *Neuphil. Mit.*, xxxviii (1937), 99-102; by Fritz Tschirch in *ADA*, lvi (1937), 160-163; by W. Golther in *LGRPh*, lix (1938), 378-379.

1974. ——— "Die Gawanhandlung in Wolframs *Parzival*." *GRM*, xxv (1937), 256-274.

1975. ——— "Zur Liebesauffassung in Wolframs *Parzival*." Pp. 15-32 in *Festschrift für Albert Leitzmann*. Jena: Frommann, 1937.

1976. ——— "Feirefiz Anschevin." *Deu. Volkstum*, xix (1937), 699-706. See comment by W. Stapel, *ibid.*, 755.

1977. ——— "Wolframs Liebesdichtung." *Deu. Volkstum*, xx (1938), 505-511.

1978. Kellermann, W. *Aufbaustil und Weltbild Chrestiens von Troyes im Percevalroman*. (Beihefte ZRPh, 88.) Halle: Niemeyer, 1936.

Rev. by W. Theodor Elwert in *Arch. Rom.*, xxi (1937), 511-513; by W. Golther in *LGRPh*, lviii (1937), 335-337; by H. Sparnaay in *Museum*, xlv (1938), 150-151; by Claudine I. Wilson in *MLR*, xxxii (1937), 628-629; by Karl Heisig in *DLZ*, lx (1939), 303-305; by Elena Eberwein in *Rom. Forsch.*, liii (1939), 367-375.

1979. Kelly, Amy. "Eleanor of Aquitaine and her Courts of Love." *Speculum*, xii (1937), 3-19.

1980. Kirsten, Rudolf. "Kurwenal." *Bayreuther Blätter*, lx (1937), 172-191.

1981. ——— "Die Erzählungen in den Dramen Richard Wagners." *Bayreuther Blätter*, lxi (1938), 22-41.

1982. Knorr, Friedrich. "Die Mittelhochdeutsche Dichtung und die Gegenwart." *Die neue Literatur*, xxxvii (1936), 446-458.

1983. ——— "Gottfried von Strassburg." *Zeit. für Deutschkunde*, l (1936), 1-17.

1984. ——— "Wolframs *Parzival* und die deutsche Reichsidee." *Zeit. für Deutschkunde*, l (1936), 160-173.

1985. ——— "Hartmann von Aue." *Zeit. für Deutschkunde*, li (1937), 161-180.

1986. ——— "Mittelhochdeutsche Dichtung." *Zeit. für Deutschkunde*, lii (1938), 650-656.

1987. ——— *Die mittelhochdeutsche Dichtung*. Jena: Diederich, 1938.

Rev. in *Zeit. für Deutschkunde*, liii (1939), 206-208; by Herbert Drube in *DLZ*, lx (1939), 947-952.

1988. ———. "Die Menschenwelt in der Epik des Hochmittelalters." [Includes Wolfram, Hartmann's *Erec*, Gottfried's *Tristan*.] *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geisteswissenschaft*, 1 (1938), 26-40.

1989. Königer, H. *Die Darstellung der Personen bei Chrétien de Troyes*. München diss. München: Mössel, 1936.

1990. Kraft, Wilhelm. "Wolfram von Eschenbach." [On 1213, J. B. Kurz, *Wolfram von Eschenbach*, 1930.] *Mein Frankenland*, iv (1933), 428-453.

1184. Krapp, George Philip. "Milton's *History of Britain*." 1932. See Harris Fletcher.

1991. Krappe, Alexander Haggerty. "Die Sage vom König im Berge." *Mitteilungen der schlesischen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde*, xxxv (1935), 76-96.

1992. ———. "Les Dieux au corbeau chez les Celtes." [Lug. Odin, Bran.] *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, cxiv (1936), 236-246.

1993. ———. "Diarmuid and Grainne." [Source of Tristan story.] *Folk-Lore*, xlvii (1936), 347-361.

1994. ———. "Who was the Green Knight?" *Speculum*, xiii (1938), 206-215.

1995. ———. "Bendigeit Vran." *Études celtiques*, iii, 5 (1938), 27-37.

1996. ———. "Sur l'épisode de la Ville Brûlante du *Perlesvaus*." *ZFSL*, lxii (1939), 404-408.

1997. Krauss, Werner. "Die Kritik des siglo de oro am Ritter- und Schäferroman." *Estudis Universitaris Catalans*, xxi (1936).

1998. Krieg, Clarice Emma. *The Cataloging of Grail Literature*. Univ. of Illinois diss., 1935 [not printed].

1177. Krohl [not Kohl], Guenter. *Entstehung des Prosaromans von Tristan und Isolde*. 1930.

1999. Kroes, H. W. J. "Zobel aus Connelant (Conne)." [Hartmann's *Erec*.] *Neophil.*, xxiii (1938), 185-187.

2000. Krüger, A[ugust] G[eorg]. *Die Quellen der Schwannritterdichtungen*. [Includes Wolfram and Kiot.] Gishorn (Hannover): Enke, 1936.

Rev. by Hellmut Rosenfeld in *Archiv*, clxxi (1937), 72-74.

2001. L., O. E. "The Inner Side of the Shield." [*Gawain and the Green Knight*.] *N & Q*, clxx (1936), 8.

2002. Lachmann, Ed. *Die Versform in Wolframs "Parzival" und die Aufgaben des Uebersetzers*. Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1938.

2003. Lapa, Rodrigues. *Amadis de Gaula: Selecção, tradução, argumento e prefacio de Rodrigues Lapa*. Lisboa, 1937.

2004. Lascelles, M. M. "Alexander and the Earthly Paradise in Mediæval English Writings." [Part II includes *Golagros and Gawane* and *Perceval le Gallois*.] *Medium Ævum*, v (1936), 79-104.

2005. Lauts, Jan. "Neue Funde und Forschungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte des ritterlichen Harnisches im Mittelalter." *Geistige Arbeit*, iv, vi (1937), 7-8.

2006. Lebesgue, Philéas. "La Matière de Bretagne et l'*Amadis de Gaule*." *Bull. des études portugaises*, i (1937), 47-58.

2007. Lecoy, Félix. *Recherches sur "Le Libro de Buen Amor" de Juan Ruiz, Archiprêtre de Hita*. [Includes prophecy of triple death, and influence of Ovid and the Arts of Love.] Paris: Droz, 1938.

Rev. by Leo Spitzer in *Revista di Filologia Hispánica*, i (1939), 266-272.

2008. Legerlotz, Gustav. *Wolfram von Eschenbach: "Parzival." Im Auszug übertragen und erklärt*. (Deutsche Ausgaben, Bd. 9.) Bielefeld and Leipzig: Velhagen & Klasing, 1937.

2009. Legge, M. Dominica, and Brereton, Georgine E. "Three hitherto unlisted MSS of the French Prose *Brute Chronicle*." *Medium Ævum*, vii (1938), 113-117.

2010. Leitzmann, Albert. *Der kleine Benecke: lexikalische Lesestücke aus Georg Friedrich Beneckes mhd. Spezialwörterbüchern*. [Includes Hartmann's *Iwein* and Wirnt von Gravenberg's *Wigalois*.] (Handbücherei für den deutschen Unterricht, 1. Reihe, Deutschkunde, No. 8.) Halle: Niemeyer, 1934.

2011. ——— (ed.). *Hartmann von Aue: "Erec."* (Altdt. Textbibl., 39.) Halle: Niemeyer, 1939.

2012. Lejeune, Rita. "*Le Lai d'Ignaure ou Lai du Prisonnier*" by Renaut. [Known to Chrétien.] Bruxelles: Palais des Académies, and Liege: Vaillant Carmanne, 1938.

Rev. by M. K. Pope in *MLR*, xxxiv (1939), 605-607.

2013. Lenz, Armin. *Die Gralsburg im Odenwald: Denkschrift über Bedeutung, darzeitigen Zustand und Möglichkeiten der Erhaltung der Wildenberg bei Amorbach*. 3 vols. Darmstadt, 1935.

2014. Lerner, Luise. *Studien zur Komposition des höfischen Romans im 13. Jahrhundert*. (Forschungen zur deutschen Sprache und Dichtung, Heft 7.) Münster: Aschendorff, 1936.

Rev. by F. Piquet in *Rev. germ.*, xxviii (1937), 188-189; by J. H. Scholte in *Museum*, xlv (1937), 36-37; by Hans Teske in *DLZ*, lxx (1938), 1271-2.

2015. Levy, O. "Marie de France a Chretien de Troyes." *Casopis pro Moderni Filologii*, xviii (1932), 178-189.

2016. ——— "Ke komposici eposu 'Li coronemenz Loois,'" *ibid.*, xviii (1931), 344-355. [Dating early Arth. references depends on this poem.]

2017. Levy, Raphael. "La Damoisele a la Mure: Étude textuelle." [A reply to John Orr's criticism of Levy's article (1242).] *Medium Ævum* vi (1937), 76-79. Answer by Orr, *ibid.*, 79-80.

2018. Lewis, C. S. *The Allegory of Love: A Study in Medieval Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936.

Rev. by O. Elton in *Medium Ævum*, vi (1937), 34-40; by T. A. Kirby in *MLN*, lxi (1937), 515-518; by Edgar C. Knowlton in *JEGP*, xxxvi (1937), 124-126; by F. Krog in *AnglB*, xlviii (1937), 333-338; by Kathleen Tillotson in *RES*, xliii (1937), 477-479; by Mona Wilson in *English*, i, iv (1937), 344-346; by G. Bonnard in *Eng. Studies*, xxi (1939), 78-82; see also comment by George R. Coffman in *SP*, xxxv (1938), 511-514.

2019. Lewis, Frank R. "Lewis Morris the Bibliophile." [Includes Morris on Geoffrey, *Brut Tysilio*, Nennius, etc.] *Jour. of the Welsh Bibliographical Soc.*, v (1938), 67-83.

2020. Lewis, Henry. "Some Medieval Welsh Prepositions." [Includes Dingestow Court *Brut*.] Pp. 293ff. of *Mélanges Linguistiques offerts à M. Holger Pederson*. Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard, 1937.

2021. ——— "Proffwydoliaeth yr Eryr." *BBCS*, ix (1938), 112-115.

2022. Lewis, Timothy. *Studies on Bran, Excalibur, the Gododdin*. Aberystwyth: The Author, 1938. [Mimeographed.]

2023. von der Leyen, F. "Zu Richard Wagners *Tristan*." *Westfälischer Erzieher* (1937), 235-239.

2024. Von Lindheim, Bogislav. "Sprachliche Studien zu Texten des MS Cotton Galba E ix." [Includes *Ywain and Gawain*.] *Anglia*, lxi (1937), 65-71.

2025. ——— *Studien zur Sprache des Manuscriptes Cotton Galba E ix*. [An expansion of diss. *Die Sprache des "Ywain und Gawain"*.] (Wiener Beiträge zur engl. Phil., Bd. 59.) Wien and Leipzig: Braumüller, 1937.

Rev. by Kurt Wittig in *AnglB*, xlix (1938), 306-309; by F. Holthausen in *LGRPh*, lx (1939), 178-179.

2026. Lippincott, Lillian. *A Bibliography of the Writings and Criticisms of Edwin Arlington Robinson*. Boston: Faxon, 1937.

Rev. by Dean P. Lockwood in *Lib. Q.*, viii (1938), 148-151.

2027. Lipphardt, W. "Studien zu den Marienklagen: Marienklage und germanische Totenklage." [Includes *Erek* and Sigune in *Parzival*.] *Beiträge*, LVIII (1934), 390-444.

2028. Litzenberg, Karl. "Tyrfinn into Excalibur?: A Note on William Morris's Unfinished Poem *In Arthur's House*." *Scand. St. and Notes*, xv (1938), 81-83.

2029. Löhmann, Otto. *Die Sage von Gawain und dem grünen Ritter*. (Schriften der Albertus-Universität, Geisteswissenschaftliche Reihe, 17.) Königsberg: Ost-Europa Verlag, 1938.

Rev. by H. L. Savage in *JEGP*, xxxviii (1939), 445-450; by Karl Brunner in *AnglB*, XLIX (1938), 336-337.

2030. Loipold, Hilda. "Ist Wolfram von Eschenbachs *Parzival* ein Entwicklungsroman?" *Deu. Volkstum*, XIX (1937), 685-692. See comment by Wilhelm Stapel, *ibid.*, 755.

2031. Loomis, Roger Sherman. "Sir Orfeo and Walter Map's *De Nugis*." *MLN*, LI (1936), 28-30.

2032. ———. "By what Route did the Romantic Tradition of Arthur reach the French?" *MP*, xxxiii (1936), 225-238.

Rev. by J. Vendryes in *Études celtiques*, II, 4 (1937), 367-369.

2033. ———. "The Modena Sculpture and Arthurian Romance." [Reply to Olschki.] *Studi medievali*, ix (1936), 1-17.

2034. ———. "Baudemaguz." [Chrétien.] *Romania*, LXIII (1937), 383-393.

2035. ———. "Gawain in the *Squire's Tale*." *MLN*, LII (1937), 413-416.

2036. ———. "Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Modena Arch-volt: A Question of Precedence." [Reply to Gerould.] *Speculum*, XIII (1938), 221-231.

2037. ———. *Arthurian Legends in Medieval Art*. Part II in Collaboration with Laura Hibbard Loomis. London: Oxford Univ. Press; and New York: Modern Lang. Association of America. 1938.

Rev. by J. E. in *Medium Ævum*, VIII (1939), 168-169; by G. H. Gerould in *Speculum*, XIV (1939), 252-254; by John J. Parry in *JEGP*, xxxviii (1939), 156-157; by Howard R. Patch in *RR*, xxx (1939), 192-194; by Friedrich Ranke in *Ger. Rev.*, XIV (1939), 219-221. See also Nitze and Taylor.

2038. ———. *Introduction to Medieval Literature, Chiefly in England*. Reading List and Bibliography. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1939.

2039. ———. "Chivalric and Dramatic Imitations of Arthurian Romance." Pp. 79-97 of *Mediaeval Studies in Memory of A. Kingsley Porter*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1939.

2040. ——— "Malory's Beaumains." *PMLA*, LIV (1939), 656-668.
1283. Lot, Ferdinand. *Nennius et "l'Historia Brittonum,"* 1934. Rev. by J. Vendryes in *Études celtiques*, III, 5 (1938), 170-175.
2041. Lozinski, G. "Encore un manuscrit du *Petit Artus de Bretagne*." *Romania*, LXIV (1938), 104-107.
2042. Lützel, Heinrich. *Die christliche Dichtung des deutschen Volkes: Ausgewählt und eingeleitet.* [Includes *Parzival*.] Paderborn: Bonifacius-Druckerei, 1937.
Rev. by Hermann Kunisch in *DLZ*, LIX (1939), 627-629.
2043. Lupo, Valeria. "Il Piano di un vasto poema negli scritti inediti di Enrico Thovez." *Convivium*, VIII (1936), 273-284.
2044. ——— "La Crisi Spirituale dell' estremo ottocento: scritti inediti di Enrico Thovez. *Il nuovo Faust o La trilogia di Tristano*." *Convivium*, x (1938), 14-25.
2045. Lüers, F. "Parzival und der Gral und ihre sagengeschichtlichen Grundlagen." *Bayer. Wochenschrift für Pflege von Heimat und Volkstum*, II (1933), 289-297; 305-312.
2046. McClean, R. J. "Segramors Roys." [Wolfram.] *London Medieval Studies*, I, ii (1938), 279.
2047. McPeck, James A. S. "Black Sails." [Thomas of Britain.] Chapter in *Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain*. (Harvard Studies in Comp. Lit.) Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1939.
2048. Magoun, F. P., Jr. "Sir Gawain and Medieval Football." *English Studies*, XIX (1937), 208-209.
2049. ——— "Kleine Beiträge zu *Sir Gawain*." *Anglia*, LXI (1937), 129-135.
2050. Manly, John M. "The Penrose MS of *La Resurrection*." [Includes Wace's *Brut*, and *The Prophecies of Merlin*.] *MP*, xxxvii (1939), 1-6.
2051. Marçais, Georges. "La Poésie andalouse du XI^e siècle." [Summary of book of Henri Pérès.] *Journal des Savants*, 1939, pp. 14-30.
2052. Markus, Andreas. "Ein *Tristan*-Bruchstück aus Grein in Ober-Österreich." *ZDA*, LXV (1938), 29-32.
2053. Martin, Henri. "L'Explicit du *Partenopeus de Blois* dans le ms. Bib. Nat. n. acq. franç. 7516." [Walter Map and Walter Archdeacon of Oxford.] *Romania*, LXV (1939), 226-233.

2054. Mary, André. *La merveilleuse histoire de Tristan et Iseut, . . . restituée en son entier et nouvellement écrite dans l'esprit des grands conteurs d'autrefois, selon la droite poésie et rhetoriques gallicane*. Paris: Gonin, 1937.

2055. Mele, Eugenio. "Eco di un ritornello brettone in un cantar d'amor galliziano." [*Tristan and Eliduc*.] *Hisp. Rev.*, iv (1936), 371-373.

2056. Menéndez-Pidal, Ramón. "Poesía árabe y poesía europea." *Revista cubana*, vi, 19-21 (1937), 5-33. Reprinted, Habana: Secretaría de Educación, 1938.

Rev. by G. C. in *Bull. Hisp.*, xxxix (1937), 430-432; by L. S. in *Les études classiques*, vii (1938), 122-123; by P. H. U. in *Rev. de Fil. Hisp.*, i (1939), 285-289.

2057. ——— "Poesía árabe y poesía europea." [Not the same item.] *Bull. Hisp.*, xl (1938), 334-423.

Rev. by William J. Entwistle in *MLR*, xxxiv (1939), 616-619; see also S. Griswold Morley.

2058. Merry, Eleanor C. *Easter—the Legends and the Fact*. [Chapters on the Holy Grail and The Story of Perceval.] (The Modern Mystic's Library, No. 1.) London: King, Littlewood and King, 1938.

2059. Micha, A. *Prolégomènes à une édition de "Cligès."* (Annales de l'Université de Lyon.) Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1937.

Rev. by Nigel Abercrombie in *Medium Ævum*, viii (1939), 218-225.

2060. ——— *La Tradition manuscrite des romans de Chrétien de Troyes*. Paris: Droz, 1939.

Rev. (with preceding item) by Nigel Abercrombie in *Medium Ævum*, viii (1939), 218-225.

2061. Michie, Sarah. "The Lover's Malady in Early Irish Romance." *Speculum*, xii (1937), 304-313.

2061a. van Mierlo, J. *Nieuwes over Heynriick van Veldeken naar aanleiding van Jungbluth's Untersuchungen zu Heinrich von Veldeken*. Antwerpen: Standaard Boekhandel, 1939. (Reprinted from *Verslagen en mededeelingen der Koninklijke Vlaamsche Academie voor taal- en letterkunde*.)

2061b. ——— *De Letterkunde van de Middeleeuwen. Met een inleiding van G. S. Overdiep*. [Section on Arthurian romance.] (Geschiedenis van de Letterkunde der Nederlanden. Eerste Deel.) Brussel: Standaard Boekhandel, [1939].

2062. Millardet, Georges. "Le Roman de Flamenca." [Contains section on courtly love.] *Revue des Cours et Conférences*, 36, ii (1935), 577-598; 37, i (1936), 673-690; 37, ii (1936), 340-360, 629-647. Reprinted, Paris: Droz, 1936.

2063. Miller, William Marion. "The Non-Noble Classes as depicted in Selected Old French Romances." *Harvard Univ. Summaries of Ph.D. Theses*, 1937, 305-308.

2064. Montague-Smith, Patrick Wykeham. "King Edward's Descent from King Arthur." *N & Q*, CLXXI (1936), 314.

2065. Morgan, Bayard Q. "On the Use of Numbers in the *Nibelungenlied*." [Includes *Tristan*.] *JEGP*, XXXVI (1937), 10-20.

2066. ———. "On Wolfram's Use of Numbers." *Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht*, XXXI (1938), 170-176.

2067. Morley, S. Griswold. "A Note on Arabic Poetry and European Poetry." [Comment on Menéndez-Pidal.] *Hisp. Rev.*, VII (1939), 344-346.

2068. Morris, Henry. "The Partholon Legend." *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*, LXVII, i (June, 1937).

2069. Mortet, André. *Poèmes et fabliaux du moyen âge allemand* (traduits). Paris: Editions Montaigne, 1939.

2070. Mutschmann, H. *Milton's Projected Epic on the Rise and Future Greatness of the Britannic Nation*. Tartu: Krüger, 1937. Rev. by E. M. W. Tillyard in *MLN*, LIII (1938), 381-383.

2071. Myres, J. N. L. "The Beginnings of Wessex." *Wessex*, III (1936), 19-21.

2072. ———. "Hengist, Horsa, and Lord Raglan." [Answer to Raglan.] *Man*, XXXVIII, 99 (1938), 96.

2073. ———. *Roman Britain*. (Historical Ass'n Pamphlets, 113.) London: Bell (for the Association), 1939.

———. See also R. G. Collingwood.

2074. N., B. H. "Pancridg Earle: Arthur's Shew." *N & Q*, CLXX (1936), 421.

2075. National Library of Wales. *A List of Monmouthshire Manuscripts and Records in the National Library of Wales*. [Includes Geoffrey of Monmouth.] Aberystwyth: National Library, 1937.

2076. ———. *Annual Report, 1937-1938*. [The list of accessions includes Arthurian items.] Aberystwyth: National Library, 1938.

2077. ———. "Arthurian Romance." [A classified bibliography for 1929-1933.] Pages 362-379 in *Bibliotheca Celtica*, New Series, I. Aberystwyth: National Library, 1939.

2078. Naumann, Hans. *Der staufische Ritter*. [An expansion of *Höfische Kultur*; makes frequent use of Gottfried and Wolfram.] Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut, 1936.

2079. ———. "Germanische Grundlagen des Rittertums." *Geistige Arbeit*, iv, xv (1937), 1-2.

2080. ———. "Die Liebe [in R. Wagner's] *Tristan*." *Westfälischer Erzieher*, 1937, pp. 235-239.

2081. ———. *Deutsche Kultur im Zeitalter des Rittertums*, Heft 1-2. (Handbuch der Kulturgeschichte, Abt. 1.) Potsdam: Athenaion, 1938.

One section, "Das Weltbild der Stauferzeit," is printed in *Zeit. f. deu. Bildung*, xiv (1938), 215-224.

2082. ———. *Deutsches Dichten und Denken von der germanischen bis zur staufischen Zeit*. (Sammlung Götschen, 1121.) Berlin: De Gruyter, 1938.

———. See also Johannes Rothe.

2083. Neckel, Gustav. *Deutsche Literatur. Sammlung literarischer Kunst- und Kultur-denkmäler in Entwicklungsreihen*. (Reihe deutsche Sagen, Bd. 2: Vom Altertum zum Mittelalter.) Leipzig: Reclam, 1935.

2084. ———. "Ewiges und Zeitliches in der Tristansage." *Westfälischer Erzieher*, vi, No. 5.

2085. Neri, Ferd. "La voce 'lai' nei testi italiani." [Ref. to *Tristano*.] *Atti della R. Accademia delle Scienze di Torino*, LXXII, ii (1936-37).

Rev. by A. S. in *Studi Danteschi*, xxi (1937), 182-183.

2086. Neumann, Wilhelm. *Die Totenklage in der erzählenden deutschen Dichtung des 13. Jahrhunderts*. [Includes Gottfried, Wolfram, and Hartmann.] Münster diss., 1934.

Newberry Library, Chicago. See Jane D. Harding.

2087. Newstead, Helaine. "The *Joie de la Cort* Episode in *Erec* and the Horn of Bran." *PMLA*, LI (1936), 13-25.

2088. ———. *Bran the Blessed in Arthurian Romance*. (Columbia Univ. Studies in English and Comp. Lit., 141.) New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1939.

2089. Nitze, William A. "The Beste Glatissant in Arthurian Romance." [Gerbert, *Perlesvaus*.] *ZRPh*, LVI (1936), 409-418.

2090. ——— and others. *Le haut livre du Graal: Perlesvaus*. Vol. II, Commentary and Notes. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1937.

Rev. by Roger Sherman Loomis in *RR*, xxix (1938), 175-180; by Roland M. Smith in *MP*, xxxvi (1938), 100-101; by Leo Spitzer in *MLN*, LIII (1938), 604-608; by J. Vendryes in *Études celtiques*, II, 4 (1937), 365-366; by M. Wilmotte in *Moyen âge*, XLVIII (1938), 205-210; by Wolfgang Golther in *LGRPh*, LX (1939), 187-188; by E. Brugger in *ZRPh*, LIX (1939), 554-576; see also Mary Williams in *Speculum*, xiv (1939), 199-208, and G. Arbour Stephens, "Carmarthenshire and the Glastonbury Legends."

2091. ——— and Taylor, Archer. "Some Recent Arthurian Studies." *MP*, xxxvi (1939), 307-312.

2092. Nutt, Alfred. *Studies in the Legend of the Holy Grail*. Reproduced in facsimile. London: Wm. Glaisher's Ltd., [1936?].

2093. Nykl, A. R. "La Poesía a ambos lados del Pirineo hacia el año 1100." *Al Andalus*, I (1933), 357-408.

1376. *El Cancionero de . . . Ibn Quzman*. 1933.

Additional reviews by Henry Corbin in *RCHL*, CI (1934), 221-223 and R. Hartmann in *GGA*, cxcvii (1935), 487-493.

2094. ——— "The Latest in Troubadour Studies." [Comment on Jeanroy's failure to recognize Arabic influence.] *Arch. Rom.*, XIX (1935), 227-236.

2095. Oakeshott, W. F. "Arthuriana at Winchester." *Wessex*, III (1936), 74-78.

2096. O'Rahilly, Thomas F. "The Goidels and their Predecessors." *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, XXI (1935), 324-372.

Rev. by M. Dillon in *YWMLS*, VII (1937), 220-221; by J. Vendryes in *Études celtiques*, II, 3 (1937), 352-358.

2097. Orr, John. "La Demoiselle a la Mure: Étude textuelle." [Comment on article by Raphael Levy, 1242.] *Medium Ævum*, V (1936), 77-78.

Orton, Harold. See W. L. Renwick.

2098. P.-G., H. "Eochaid Aingces, King of the Britons." [Rhydderch Hael and Battle of Arthuret.] *N & Q*, CLXXIV (1938), 46.

2099. Pagès, Amedeu. *La Poésie française en Catalogne du XIII^e siècle à la fin du XV^e*. Toulouse: Privat, and Paris: Didier, 1936.

1408. Park, Rosemary. *Das Bild von R. Wagners "Tristan,"* 1935.

Rev. by W. Golther in *LGRPh*, LVIII (1937), 247, and in *DLZ*, LVII (1936), 1359-60; by Theodor Kochs in *ADA*, LXII (1936), 218-220; by R. Peacock in *MLR*, XXXIII (1938), 127-128; by Otto Springer in *JEGP*, XXXVII (1938), 108-109.

2100. Parry, John Jay. *Brut y Brenhinedd: Cotton Cleopatra Version*. Edited and Translated. Cambridge: Mediæval Academy of America, 1937.

Rev. by H. I. Bell in *History*, xxiii (1938), 65-68; by Th. M. Chotzen in *Museum*, xlv (1938), 295-297; by Henry Lewis in *Y Llenor*, xvi (1937), 124-126; by J. E. L[loyd] in *EHR*, LIII (1938), 336; by M. L. Sjoestedt-Jonval in *Moyen âge*, xlvii (1937), 294-295; by Kenneth Jackson in *MLR*, xxxiii (1938), 61-62; by R. Thurneysen in *Hist. Zeitschrift*, clvii (1937), 192-193; by Ifor Williams in *Arch. Camb.*, xcii (1937), 177-178; by Urban T. Holmes, Jr. in *Language*, xiv (1938), 304; by J. Vendryes in *Études celtiques*, iii, 5 (1938), 180-184; by M. Hélin in *Rev. belge*, xviii (1939), 128-129.

2101. ——— "Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Paternity of Arthur." *Speculum*, xiii (1938), 271-277.

1414. ——— and Schlauch, Margaret. *Arthurian Bibliography*. Vol. II (1930-1935). New York: Modern Lang. Association of America, 1936.

2102. Patmore, Derek. "Pre-Raphaelites Restored: The Wall Paintings in the Oxford Union Library." *Studio*, cxi (1936), 324-325.

2103. Pauphilet, Albert. "Nouveaux fragments manuscrits de Chrétien de Troyes." [Additional fragments of *Cligès* and *Erec* from Manuscript of Annonay.] *Romania*, LXIII (1937), 310-323.

2104. ——— *Poètes et romanciers du moyen âge*. [Selected texts—Roland de Villon—in modern French.] Paris: Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, 1939.

2105. Pérès, Henri. *La Poésie andalouse en arabe classique au XI^e siècle: Ses aspects généraux et sa valeur documentaire*. Paris: Maisonneuve, 1937.

Summarized by Georges Marçais in *Journal des Savants*, 1939, pp. 14-30; rev. by Marcel Bataillon in *Bull. Hisp.*, xli (1939), 187-191.

2106. Perry, L. M. "Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, Line 2511." *MLR*, xxxii (1937), 80-81.

2107. Peterich, R. "Wo liegt die Gralsburg?" *Die Propyläen*, xxxv (1938), 122.

2108. Piccolo, Francesco. *Arte e poesia dei trovatori*. Napoli: Ricciardi, 1938.

2109. Pickering, F. P. "A Note on J. Boyd: *Ulrich Fûetrer's 'Parzival,' Material and Sources*." *Leeds Studies in English and Kindred Languages*, v (1936), 93-95.

1429. Plessow, G. *Gotische Tektonik im Wortkunstwerk*. 1931. Rev. by Kurt Herbert Halbach in *LGRPh*, lvii (1936), 314-318.

2110. Pontecorvo, Aurelia. "Une Fonte del Jaufré." [Chrétien's *Perceval*.] *Arch. Rom.*, xxii (1938), 399-401.

2111. Popp, Emil. *Die Sprache Ulrichs von dem Türlin*. (Forschungen zur sudetendeutschen Heimatkunde, Heft 7.) Reichenberg and Leipzig: Kraus, 1937.

Rev. by Alfred Götze in *LGRPh*, LIX (1938), 85-87.

2112. Powell, E. O. "From the Brut of the Chronicle of England (Manuscripts of Jesus College, Oxford, No. 5) page xlii, column 2." [A reprint of the passage, in English, about Vortiger's castle and Merlyn.] *Folk-Lore*, XLVIII (1937), 91-93.

2113. Praz, Mario. "La Leggenda d'Artù." Pp. 261-268 of *Studi e Svaghi inglesi*. Firenze: Sansoni, 1937.

2114. Raglan, Lord (FitzRoy Richard Somerset). "Quasi-Historical Characters: Great Figures on the Borderland of History and Legend, No. 3, King Arthur." *Illustrated London News*, xcvi, 2552 (Mar. 21, 1936), 518.

2115. ———. *The Hero: A Study in Tradition, Myth, and Drama*. London: Methuen, 1936.

Rev. by Stanley Casson in *Antiquity*, xii (1938), 123-126; by Warren R. Dawson in *Folk-Lore*, XLVII (1936), 403-404; see also Ernest Bernbaum in *MLN*, LII (1937), 581-582, and Alwyn D. Rees.

2116. ———. "Facts and Superstitions." [Comment inspired by Lethbridge's review of Collingwood and Myres.] *Man*, xxxviii, 80 (1938), 80.

1456. Rahn, Otto. *Kreuzzug gegen den Gral*, 1933, and 1457, *La Croisade contre le Graal*. 1935.

Rev. by Ludwig Wolff in *ZRPh*, LIX (1939), 115-118; by Ettore Allodoli in *Leonardo*, vii (1936), 134-136; see also footnote by Myrrha Lot-Borodine in *Humanisme et Renaissance*, vi (1939), 367.

2117. Raiter, Gladys Wilhelmina. "The Morphology of the Auchinleck *Sir Tristram*." [Wholly linguistic.] Abstract in *Summaries of Doctoral Dissertations . . . Northwestern Univ.*, III (1935), 5-7.

2118. Rapp, Sister Catherine Teresa. *Burger and Peasant in the Works of Thomasin von Zirclara, Freidank, and Hugo von Trimberg*. Catholic Univ. diss. Washington: Catholic Univ., 1936.

Rev. by Arthur F. J. Remy in *Ger. Rev.*, xii (1937), 281-282; by Hans Teske in *LGRPh*, LVIII (1937), 377-378 and in *ADA*, LVI (1937), 70-71.

2119. Rast, E. *Vergleich, Gleichnis, Metapher, und Allegorie bei Konrad von Würzburg*. Heidelberg diss. Würzburg: Mayr, 1936.

2120. Raphael, Maxwell Isaac. "The Lover's Helper: Studies in the Development of a Literary Type." Abstract in *Harvard Univ. Summaries of Ph.D. Theses* (1937), 308-311.

2121. Rathborne, Isabel E. *The Meaning of Spenser's Fairyland*. [Includes Arthurian material.] New York: Columbia Univ. Press, and London: Milford, 1938.

Rev. by B. E. C. Davis in *MLR*, xxxiv (1939), 87-88; by H. S. V. Jones in *JEGP*, xxxviii (1939), 289-291.

2122. Réau, Louis and Cohen, Gustave. *L'Art du moyen âge, arts plastiques, art littéraire, et la civilisation française*. (L'Évolution de l'humanité. Synthèse collective, dirigée par Henri Berr, 40.) Preface by Henri Berr. Paris: La Renaissance du Livre, 1935. [Develops the study Cohen made in 1933 in the Glotz volume. Item 1427. Includes Chrétien de Troyes and courtly romance in the 13th cent.]

Rev. by Mauriceau Beaupré in *Polybiblion*, cxc (1936), 83-85; by Werner Mulertt in *DLZ*, lvii (1936), 1356-1359; by Lucille Ninane in *Rev. belge*, xvi (1937), 769-773.

2123. Rees, Alwyn D. "The Divine Hero in Celtic Hagiology." [Reference to Lord Raglan's *Hero of Tradition*.] *Folk-Lore*, xlvii (1936), 30-41.

2124. Reid, Margaret C. J. *The Arthurian Legend in Modern Literature*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1938.

2125. Renwick, W. L. and Orton, Harold. *The Beginnings of English Literature to Skelton, 1509*. London: Cresset Press, 1939.

2126. Richards, G. Melville. "Carwriaeth Gwenhwyfar (Cyfeithiad o ran o'r Tain Bo Fraich)." [Gwenhwyfar is translation of Finnabair.] *Y Llenor*, xiv (1935), 152-161.

2127. ——— "The Relative Sentence in the Four Branches of the Mabinogi." *Études celtiques*, i (1936), 272-283.

1478. Richey, Margaret Fitzgerald. *The Story of Parzival and the Grail*. 1935.

Rev. by J. K. B. in *Medium Ævum*, v (1936), 125-128; by F. Norman in *MLR*, xxxi (1936), 455-456; by F. Ranke in *DLZ*, lviii (1937), 1620-1621.

2128. ——— "Zu der Einleitung von Wolframs *Parzival*." *ZDPh*, lxiii (1938), 385-386.

2129. ——— "Die edeln Armen: A Study of Hartmann von Aue." (*Erec*; also Wolfram.) *London Mediæval Studies*, i, ii (1938), 265-278.

2130. Richter, Jul. *Der Zweifel und seine Ueberwindung: Das Grundthema von Wolframs "Parzival"*. (Mitteilungen des Wolfram von Eschenbach Bundes, Heft 4.) Amorbach: Wildenbergverlag, 1938.

2131. ——— "Der Zweifel und seine Ueberwindung in Wolframs *Parzival*." (Schluss.) *Wartburg*, Berlin, xxxvii, ix (Sept. 1938), 264-272.

2132. ——— "Germantum und Christentum in Wolframs *Parzival*." *Deu. ev. Erziehung*, XLVIII, ii (1937), 52-68.

2133. Richter, Werner. "Der literarische Raum des *Lanzelet* von Ulrich von Zatzikhofen." *ZDA*, LXXV (1938), 33-39.

2134. Ricolfi, Alfonso. "Il mistero del Graal e le allegorie dantesche." *Corriere Padano*, Oct. 21, 1937.

2135. ——— "Il Graal e i 'Fedeli d'Amore.'" [Includes comment on Evola.] *Corriere Padano*, Oct. 26, 1937.

2136. Riedel, F. Carl. *Crime and Punishment in the Old French Romances*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, and London: Milford, 1939.

2137. Roach, William. "A New *Perlesvaus* Fragment." *Speculum*, XIII (1938), 216-220.

2138. ——— "Eucharistic Tradition in the *Perlesvaus*." *ZRPh*, LIX (1939), 10-56.

2139. Roberts, W. F. J. "Ellipsis of the Subject Pronoun in Middle English." [Includes La5amon.] *London Medieval Studies*, I (1937), 107-115.

2140. Robinson, Henry Leon. *The Language of the Scribes of the Oxford Manuscript Hatton 82*. [Perlesvaus.] Part of Univ. of Chicago diss. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Libraries, 1935.

2141. ——— "The Sword of John the Baptist in the *Perlesvaus*." *MLN*, LI (1936), 25-27.

2142. Rosenberg, Melrich V. *Eleanor of Aquitaine: Queen of the Troubadours and of the Courts of Love*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, and London: Hamish Hamilton, 1937.

Rev. by Thomas A. Kirby in *MLN*, LIII (1937), 477-478; by Stanley Painter in *Speculum*, XII (1937), 411-412; by Curtis H. Walker in *AHR*, XLIII (1938), 358-359.

2143. Rotondi, G. "Rileggendo il *Morgante*." *Convivium*, VIII (1936), 381-424.

2144. de Rougemont, Denis. *L'Amor et l'Occident*. Paris: Plon, 1939.

Rev. by Myrrha Lot-Borodine in *Humanisme et Renaissance*, VI (1939), 365-372.

2145. Ruggieri, Jole M. "Versioni italiane della *Queste del Saint Graal*." *Arch Rom.*, XXI (1937), 471-486.

2146. von Rundstedt, Hans-Gerd. "Die Wirtschaftsethik des Hugo von Trimberg." [Includes *Der Renner*.] *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, XXVI (1936), 61-72.

2147. Savage, Henry L. "'Scrape' in *Sir Gawain*." *LTLS*, Sept. 26, 1936, p. 768. See correction, *ibid.*, Oct. 31, 1936, p. 887.

2148. ——— "Brow or Brawn?" [*Gawain and the Green Knight*, 1454-61.] *MLN*, LII (1937), 37-38.

2149. ——— "Sir Gawain and the Order of the Garter." *ELH*, v (1938), 146-149.

2150. Savage, John J. "An Old Irish Version of *Laodamia and Protesilaus*." [A note on the relation to *The Lady of the Fountain*.] Pp. 265-272 of *Studies in Honor of Edward Kennard Rand*. New York: Leslie Webber Jones, 1938.

2150a. Sawicki, Stanislaw. *Die Eufemiavisor: Stilstudien zur Nordischen Reimliteratur des Mittelalters*. (Skrifter Utgivna av Kungliga Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund, 28.) Lund: Gleerup, and Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1939.

2151. Scharschuh, Heinz. *Gottfried von Strassburg, Stilmittel, Stilästhetik*. Freiburg diss. (Germanische Studien, Heft 197.) Berlin: Ebering, 1938.

2152. von Scherling, Erik. "The History of King Lear in an early 15th Century Manuscript." [Brut Chronicle.] *Rotulus*, iv (1937), 1-5 and 10.

2153. ——— "Roman de Tristan, in Prose: Description of recently discovered fragments of a 15th Cent. MS." *Rotulus*, iv (1937), 20.

2154. Scheunemann, Ernst. "Hartmann von Aue und Chrétien de Troyes." *Abteilung für neuere Phil.: 108. Jahresbericht der Schles. Gesellschaft für vaterländ. Kultur*, 1935, pp. 150-157. Breslau, 1936.

2155. ——— *Artushof und Abenteuer. Zeichnung höfischen Daseins in Hartmanns Erec*. (Deutschkundliche Arbeiten A, Bd. 8.) Breslau: Maruschke & Berendt, 1937.

Rev. by F. P. in *Rev. germ.*, xxix (1938), 69-70; by Herbert Drube in *DLZ*, LIX (1938), 1060-1062; by H. Sparnaay in *LGRPh*, LX (1939), 315-317; by Bodo Mergel in *ADA*, LVIII (1939), 36-43.

2154. Schlauch, Margaret. *Romance in Iceland*, 1934.

Additional reviews by Thor J. Beck in *RR*, xxvii (1936), 313-317; by F. M. in *Rev. germ.*, xxvii (1936), 175; by C. L. W. in *RES*, xvi (1938), 238; by S. d'Ardenne in *Moyen âge*, XLVIII (1938), 302-304.

2156. ——— "The *Dámusta Saga* and French Romance." [Arthurian parallels.] *MP*, xxxv (1937), 1-13.

2157. ——— "Chaucer's *Merchant's Tale* and Courtly Love." *ELH*, iv (1937), 201-212.

2158. ——— "The Allegory of Church and Synagogue." [Perlesvaus.] *Speculum*, xiv (1939), 448-464.

——— See John J. Parry.

2158. Schmitz, Wilhelm. *Traum und Vision in der erzählenden Dichtung des deutschen Mittelalters*. 1934.

Additional reviews by Gustav Ehrismann in *LGRPh*, lvii (1936), 234-235; by Hans Steinger in *ADA*, lvi (1937), 28-30.

2159. Schreiber, Albert. "Der Herkunft des Edelherren von Durne, der Gönner Wolframs von Eschenbach." *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins*, xlviii (1934), 299-347.

2160. Schreiber, Hans. *Studien zum Prolog in mittelhochdeutscher Dichtung*. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1935.

Rev. by Arthur Witte in *DLZ*, lix (1938), 235-237.

2161. S[chröder], E. "Der rührende Reim bei Heinrich v. Veldeke." *ZDA*, lxxv (1938), 191-192.

2162. Schröder, Edward. "Zur Datierung des *Morte Arthure*." *Anglia*, lx (1936), 396.

2163. ——— "Der Text des *Johan úz dem virgiere*." *ZDA*, lxxvi (1939), 114-121.

2164. Schütte, Marie. *Die germanische Besiedlung Britanniens in der englischen Geschichtsschreibung besonders des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*. (Arbeiten aus dem Seminar für englische Sprache und Kultur an der Hansischen Universität.) Hamburg: de Gruyter, 1936.

2165. Schultheiss, H. *Die Bedeutung der Familie im Denken Wolframs von Eschenbach*. Breslau diss. (Sprache und Kultur der germanischen und romanischen Völker, Bd. 26.) Breslau: Priebsch, 1937.

2166. Schwarz, Gertrud. "*Arebeit*" bei mittelhochdeutschen Dichtern. [Includes Hartmann.] (Bonner Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie.) Würzburg: Triltsch, 1938.

1549. Schwieterung, Julius. *Deutsche Dichtung des Mittelalters* [continued]. [Heft 6 (1936), includes Wolfram and Gottfried.]

2167. Senn, A. "Deutsch lebendig." [Illustrations from Wolfram.] *Ger. Rev.*, x (1935), 49.

2168. Shirley, R. "Arthur of Britain." *Cornhill*, clx (July, 1939), 34-45.

2169. Siebert, Johannes. "Ecidemôn." [A fabulous animal in Wolfram.] *ZDPPh*, lxii (1937), 248-264.

2170. Singer, Samuel. *Germanisch-romanisches Mittelalter. Aufsätze und Vorträge*. Zürich and Leipzig: Niehans, 1935.

Rev. by H. Sparnaay in *Museum*, XLIV (1936), 37-38; by Carlo Antoni in *Studi germanici*, 1 (1935), 675-679.

2171. ———. *Neue Parzival-Studien*. Zurich and Leipzig: Niehans, 1937.

2172. ———. *Wolfram und der Graal: Neue Parzival Studien*. (Schriften der lit. Gesellschaft, Bern, 2.) Bern: Lang & Cie., 1939.

2173. Slover, Clark H. "A Note on the Names of Glastonbury." [Correction of L. H. Gray, item 1016.] *Speculum*, XI (1936), 129-132.

2174. Smirnov, A. A. (ed.). *Mul bez Usdy. Frantsuzskii Arturovskii Roman Epokhi zrelogo Feodalizma*. [La Mule sans Frain of Paien de Maisières. Introduction and notes. Discusses the Arthurian cycle in relation to late feudal culture.] Moscow and Leningrad: Academia, 1934.

2175. Smithers, G. V. "Notes on Middle English Texts." [Includes *Arthur and Merlin*.] *London Medieval Studies*, 1, ii (1938), 208-224.

2176. Spanke, Hans. "La Poésie lyrique des Troubadours." [Rev. of Jeanroy, item 1133.] *Studi medievali*, VIII (1935), 17-55.

1583. Spargo, John W. *Virgil the Necromancer*. 1934.

Additional reviews by J. B[olte] in *Zeit. für Volkskunde*, XLIII (1933), 147-148; by George L. Hamilton in *JEGP*, xxxvi (1937), 112-120; by Federico Lenz in *Revista di filologia e d'istruzione classica*, LXVI (1938), 86-92; by Walter Miller in *Classical Journ.* xxxiii (1937), 173-176; by Jean Gessler in *Rev. belge*, xvi (1937), 676-678.

1588. Sparnaay, H. *Hartmann von Aue. Studien zu einer Biographie*. 1933.

Additional reviews by F. Norman in *MLR*, xxxi (1936), 457-458; by Ludwig Wolff in *ZRPPh*, LVIII (1938), 735-737.

2177. ———. Vol. II [of the same]. Halle: Niemeyer, 1938.

Rev. by H. W. J. Kroes in *Levende Talen*, 103 (1939), 74-75; by Herbert Drube in *DLZ*, LX (1939), 305-308.

2178. Spence, Lewis. *Legendary London. Early London in Tradition and History*. [Refs. to Griscom's edition of Geoffrey.] London: Robert Hale & Co., 1937.

2179. Speyer, Marian F. "The Cemetery Incident in Chrétien and its Celtic Original." [Second Battle of Moytura; also *Queste*.] *RR*, xxviii (1937), 195-203.

2180. Stapel, Wilhelm. "Die kleine Obilot." [Wolfram.] *Deu. Volkstum*, xviii (1936), 108-114.

2181. ——— "Parzival ethisch?" [Comment on Keferstein.] *Deu. Volkstum*, XIX (1937), 735-736.

2182. ——— "Parzivals 'Sünden.'" *Deu. Volkstum*, XIX (1937), 692-698.

2183. ——— [Wolframs *Parzival*: comment on Loipold.] *Deu. Volkstum*, XIX (1937), 754-756.

2184. ——— *Wolfram von Eschenbachs "Parzival."* [Free prose translation.] Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, [1937].
Selections printed in *Deu. Volkstum*, XIX (1937), 728-735 and 756.

2185. Starke, Fritz-Joachim. *Populäre englische Chroniken des 15. Jahrhunderts: eine Untersuchung über ihre literarische Form.* [Includes *Brut* or *Chronicles of England*, Caxton, 1480.] Berlin: Junker & Dünhaupt, 1935.

Rev. by Hermann Heuer in *Est.* LXXII (1937), 102-104.

2186. Stefanovici-Svensk, I. Ol. "Richard Wagner: Opera si Omul." *Revista germanistilor români*, II (1933), 3-13.

2187. Steiner, Arpad. "The Identity of the Italian Count in Andreas Capellanus' *De Amore*." *Speculum*, XIII (1938), 304-308.

2188. Stephens, G. Arbour. "Carmarthenshire and the Oxford University." [Geoffrey of Monmouth.] *Carmarthen Journal*, Dec. 22, 1939.

2189. ——— "The City of St. Davids and King Arthur's Sword." *Swansea and Welsh Wales Guardian*, Aug. 21, 1936.

2190. ——— "Saint David and Brechfa: the Original Site of the Mabinogion Story: the Lady of the Fountain." *Swansea and West Wales Guardian*, Sept. 25, 1936.

2191. ——— "Brechfa and the Lady of the Fountain: What Spenser said about her." *Swansea and West Wales Guardian*, Oct. 2, 1936.

2192. ——— "Mons Badonicus, or the Battle of Badon Mount. Was it in Cardiganshire or Radnorshire?" (With map.) *Cambrian News and Welsh Farmers Gazette*, Nov. 13, 1936.

2193. ——— "The County of Montgomery as a Center of Arthurian Lore and Legend." *Swansea and West Wales Guardian*, Dec. 4, 1936.

2194. ——— "St. Barri and North Wales." [Arthurian associations.] *North Wales Pioneer*, Feb. 18, 1937.

2195. ——— "Spenser's *Faerie Queen* and Wales." Paper read before the Celtic Congress at Edinburgh. Reported in *Western Mail*, July 17, 1937, and in *The Scotsman* of the same date.

2196. ——— "Merlin and the Valley of Darnantes." *Swansea Guardian*, Oct. 22 and 29, Nov. 5, 1937.
2197. ——— "A New Light on the Arthurian Battlefields." *Swansea and West Wales Guardian*, Mar. 25, April 1, 8, and 22, 1938. Reprinted, Haverfordwest: J. W. Hammond & Co., [1938].
2198. ——— "Was there a Welsh God of Medicine?" [Lludd and Llevelis.] *Medical Press and Circular*, cxcvii (1938), No. 5180.
2199. ——— "The Romance of a Tinopolis." [Much Arthurian material.] Talk before Llanelly Rotary Club. Reported in *Swansea and West Wales Guardian* on June 10, 1938.
2200. ——— "Mice and the Celtic Religion." [Merlin, etc.] *Herald of Wales*, Nov. 26, 1938.
2201. ——— "Folklore in Merlin's Country." *Carmarthen Journal*, Jan. 20, 1939.
2202. ——— "Historic Shir Gar Parish." [Arthurian references.] *Herald of Wales & Swansea Weekly Post*, Apr. 15, 1939.
2203. ——— "Carmarthenshire and the Glastonbury Legends. Was the Isle of Avalon in the Lordship of Kidwelly?" Reprinted from the *Carmarthen Journal*, June 2, 1939. A second edition reprinted with the next item.
2204. ——— "The Topographical Importance of Kidwelly and the Burry Estuary in Connection with the Arthurian Romances." Reprinted from the *Carmarthen Journal*, Nov. 25, 1938.
2205. ——— "Carmarthen as the Birth-place of Geoffrey of Monmouth: Was Geoffrey interested in Alchemy?" Reprinted from *Carmarthen Journal*, Aug. 18 and 25, 1939.
2206. ——— "The Great Part played by Radnorshire in Celtic Mythology." *Trans. of the Radnorshire Soc.*, ix (1939), 47-58.
2207. Stevens, C. E. "Gildas and the Civitates of Britain." *EHR*, LII (1937), 193-203.
2208. ——— "Magnus Maximus in British History." *Études celtiques*, III, 5 (1938), 86-94.
2209. Stöckli, A. *Hartmann von Aue: Sein literarisches Werk*. Wohlen: Meyer, 1936.
2210. Stone, Herbert K. "Corrections—Le Karrenritter de Foerster." *Romania*, LXIII (1937), 398-401.

2211. Strassberg, St. *Die Entführung und Befreiung der Königin Ginevra: Ein Beitrag zur Erläuterung der "Lancelot" von Chrestien de Troyes.* Berlin diss., 1937.

2212. Sugden, Herbert W. *The Grammar of Spenser's "Faerie Queene."* Duke Univ. diss. Philadelphia: Linguistic Soc. of America, 1936.

2213. Sutherland, C. H. V. *Coinage and Currency in Roman Britain.* [Includes references to Arthur and Badon, and Vortigern.] Oxford: Univ. Press, and London: Milford, 1937.

2214. Tanqueray, F. H. "Giraut de Barri et le Roman de Tristan." *Medium Ævum*, vi (1937), 1-20.

2215. Tatlock, J. S. P. "Geoffrey of Monmouth's Estrildis." *Speculum*, xi (1936), 121-124.

2216. ——— "The Date of Henry I's Charter to London." [Help in dating Geoffrey's *Historia*.] *Speculum*, xi (1936), 461-469.

2217. ——— "Caradoc of Llancarfan." *Speculum*, xiii (1938), 139-152.

2218. ——— "Geoffrey of Monmouth's Motives for writing his *Historia*." *Proc. American Philosophical Soc.*, lxxix, iv (1938), 695-703.

2219. ——— "The Dates of the Arthurian Saints' Legends." *Speculum*, xiv (1939), 345-365.

Taylor, Archer. See Nitze, William A.

2220. Thomas, R. J. "Cysylltiad Arthur â Gogledd Ceredigion." [The connection of Arthur with North Cardigan.] *BBCS*, viii (1936), 124-125.

2221. ——— *The Brychan Dynasty in East Glamorgan.* Cardiff: William Lewis, 1936.

2222. ——— "Gwlad-yr-Haf." *BBCS*, ix (1937), 40.

2223. Thomov, Thomas S. "Thèmes et problèmes dans les romans de Chrétien de Troyes." *Annuaire de l'Université de Sofia, Faculté historico-philologique*, xxxii, xii (1936). Bulgarian text with summary in French.

2224. Thompson, James Westfall. "Catharist Social Ideas in Medieval French Romance." *RR*, xxvii (1936), 99-104.

2225. ——— "Ancient Celtic Symptoms in Arthurian Romance." *Trans. Hon. Soc. Cymmrodorion*, for 1936. Pp. 137-142.

2226. ——— "On the Date of the *Lancelot*." *MLN*, lii (1937), 172.

1368. Thompson, Stith. *Motif Index of Folk Literature*. The index volume (vi) was published in 1936. Indiana Univ. Studies, 111-112 and FF Communications, 117.

Additional reviews by G. H. Gerould in *Journ. Am. Folklore*, XLIX (1936), 275-276; by R. Fick in *GGA*, cc (1938), 474-479.

2227. Thornton, Fr. C. *The French Element in Spenser's Poetical Works*. Toulouse diss., 1938.

2228. Thornton, Sister Mary Madelina. *Malory's "Le Morte D'Arthur" as a Christian Epic*. Univ. of Illinois M.A. diss., 1934 [unpublished].

2229. Thurneysen, R. "Partholón." [Reply to van Hamel.] *ZCPH*, xx (1936), 375-381.

2230. Tihany, Leslie Charles. "The Avowing of King Arthur: A morphological and phonological study of words in rhyme and of certain non-rhyming words." Abstract in *Summaries of Doctoral Dissertations* . . . *Northwestern Univ.*, iv (1936), 5-7.

2231. ———. "The Return of the Hero in Early Irish Literature." [Compare with Arthur's return from Avalon.] *RR*, xxvii (1936), 269-273.

2232. Trathnigg, Gilbert. "Fragment von Heinrichs von Freiburg *Tristan* aus St. Pölten." *ZDA*, LXXIII (1936), 175-176.

2233. Traub, Gerhard. *Studien zum Einfluss Ciceros auf die höfische Moral*. [Includes Hartmann, Wolfram, Gottfried.] Greifswald diss., 1933. (Deutsches Werden, 1.) Greifswald: Bamberg, 1933.

Rev. by H. Teske in *ADA*, LIII (1934), 145-146; by Ernst Scheunemann in *ZDPH*, LXII (1937), 436-438.

2234. Tscharnner, Eduard Horst. "China in der deutschen Dichtung des Mittelalters und der Renaissance." [Includes Wolfram.] *Simica*, ix (1934), 8-31.

2235. Vendryes, J. and Wilmart, André. "Une liste des noms bretons." [Salamun, Elenn, Gerent, Maucan, etc., in insular MS of about 1000.] *Études celtiques*, III, 5 (1938), 144-154.

2236. Veselovskii, A. A. (trans.). *Roman o Tristane i Izol'de*. [Bédier.] Introduction by Academician A. N. Veselvoskii; general ed., preface and notes by A. A. Smirnov. Moscow: Goslitizdat, 1938.

2237. Vinaver, Eugène. "A Note on the Earliest Printed Texts of Malory's *Morte D'Arthur*." *Bull. John Rylands Lib.*, xxiii (1939), 102-106.

2238. Visser, G. J. "Cyfranc Lludd a Llefelys." *Études celtiques*, I, 2 (1936), 261-271.

2239. ———. *Laſamon: An Attempt at Vindication*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1935.

2240. ———. "The Passing of Arthur and Ymadawiad Arthur." *Neophil.*, xxi (1937), 46-52.

2241. d. V[ogel], K. S. "Or est venuz qui aunera." [Chrétien.] *Neophil.*, xxi (1936), 263-264.

2242. Vorontzoff, Tania. "Malory's Story of Arthur's Roman Campaign." [Winchester MS.] *Medium Ævum*, vi (1937), 99-121.

2243. Vossler, Karl. "Die Dichtung der Trobadors und ihre europäische Wirkung." *Rom. Forsch.*, li (1937), 253-278.

2244. ———. "L'Importance européenne des troubadours." *Investigaciones lingüísticas, Univ. Nac. Autónoma de México*, v (1938), 34-51.

2245. Wade-Evans, A. W. "Achau'r Saint, B." [Arthurian references.] *Études celtiques*, i (1936), 284-291.

2246. ———. "The Chartres *Historia Brittonum*." [English trans. with notes.] *Arch. Camb.*, xcii (1937), 64-85.

2247. ———. *Nennius's "History of the Britons" together with "The Annals of the Britons" and "Court Pedigrees of Hywel the Good," also "The Loss of Britain."* London: S.P.C.K., 1938.

2248. Wagner, Kurt. "Wirklichkeit und Schicksal im Epos des Eilhart von Oberg." *Archiv*, clxx (1936), 161-184.

1682. Walberg, E. *Quelques aspects de la littérature anglo-normande*. 1936.

Rev. by S. d'Ardenne in *Moyen âge*, xlv (1936), 292-294; by H. P. Dyggve in *Neophil. Mit.*, xxxviii (1937), 93-95; by Grace Frank in *Speculum*, xii (1937), 137-138; by Johan Vising in *Medium Ævum*, vi (1937), 238-240; by Arthur Långfors in *LGRPh*, lxx (1938), 270-271; by Mario Pelaez in *Leonardo*, ix (1938), 62-63; by Joachim Storost in *Archiv*, clxxiv (1938), 215-220.

604. Walker, Emil. *Der Monolog im höfischen Epos*. 1928.

Additional rev. by Alfred Hübner in *ADA*, lvi (1937), 108-112.

2249. Walsche, M. O'C. "The Fabulous Geography of Lanzelet." *London Medieval Studies*, i (1937), 93-106.

2250. ———. "Der Künec von Kukumerlant." *London Medieval Studies*, i, ii (1938), 280-285.

2251. Wangelin, Anne-Marie. *Die Liebe in den Tristandichtungen der Viktorianischen Zeit*. Tübingen diss., 1937.

2252. Warlow, G. H. "Aristobolus first to preach Christianity in Britain." *N & Q*, clxxvi (1939), 211-212.

2253. Watson, Sara Ruth. "Gorboduc and the Theory of Tyrrannicide." *MLR*, xxxiv (1939), 355-366.

2254. Webb, William Stanford. "Vergil in Spenser's Epic Theory." [Includes influence of Arthurian story on the Tudor spirit.] *ELH*, iv (1937), 62-84.

2255. Weber, Alfons. *Studien zum Abwandlung der höfischen Ethik in der Spruchdichtung des 13. Jahrhunderts*. Bonn diss. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1936.

1690. Weber, Gottfried. *Der Gottesbegriff des "Parzival."* 1935. Rev. by R. Newald in *LGRPh*, LVIII (1937), 93-94; by Friedrich Ranke in *ADA*, LVI (1937), 130-131.

2256. Weber, Leopold. *Parzival und der Gral: von Artus' Ritten, vom Zauberer Klinschor, und von Parzival, dem Gottsucher*. Stuttgart: Thienemanns, 1936.

2257. Weigand, Hermann J. "Die epischen Zeitverhältnisse in den Graldichtungen Crestiens und Wolframs." *PMLA*, LIII (1938), 917-950.

1696. Wells, John Edwin. *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English*. Seventh supplement published in Dec. 1938.

Rev. by Hermann M. Flasdieck in *AngleB*, I (1939), 67-69.

2258. West, C. B. *Courtoisie in Anglo-Norman Literature*. (Medium Ævum monographs, No. 3.) Oxford: Blackwell, 1938.

Rev. by Howard R. Patch in *Speculum*, XIII (1938), 479-480; by R. C. Johnston in *MLR*, xxxiv (1939), 446-447; by G. V. Smithers in *RES*, xv (1939), 471-473.

2259. White, Frederic Connett. "The Encaverned Barbarossa." *N & Q*, CLXXVI (1939), 409.

1725. Williams, Ifor. *Canu Llywarch Hen*. 1935.

Rev. in *ZCPH*, xx (1936), 535-536; by J. Vendryes in *Études celtiques*, II, 3 (1937), 165-169; by T. J. Morgan in *YWMLS*, vi (1936), 187-189. See also Kenneth Jackson.

1728. ———. "Notes on Nennius." 1935.

Rev. by T. J. Morgan in *YWMLS*, vi (1936), 192-193; by J. Vendryes in *Études celtiques*, II, 4 (1937), 386-387.

2260. ———. *Canu Aneurin. Gyda Rhagymadrodd a Nodiau*. Caerdydd: Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, 1938. [Contains earliest (?) reference to Arthur.]

See Kenneth Jackson; also Timothy Lewis, "The Matter of the Gododin."

2261. ———. "Tristfardd, Bardd Urien." [Nennius.] *BBCS*, VIII (1937), 331-332.

2262. ——— "The Nennian Preface: a possible emendation." *BBCS*, ix (1939), 342-344.

——— See Crawford, O. G. S.

2263. Williams, Mary. "More about Bleddri." *Études celtiques*, II, 4 (1937), 219-245.

2264. ——— "Apropos of an Episode in *Perlesvaus*." *Folklore*, XLVIII (1937), 263-266.

2265. ——— "An Early Ritual Poem in Welsh." *Speculum*, XIII (1938), 38-51.

Rev. by J. Vendryes in *Études celtiques*, III, 5 (1937), 205-206.

2266. ——— "Notes on *Perlesvaus*." [Comment on Nitze's edition.] *Speculum*, XIV (1939), 199-208.

Williams, William. See National Library of Wales.

2267. Williamson, George. "Hakewell and the Arthurian Legend." *MLN*, L (1938), 462-463.

Wilmart, André. See Vendryes, J.

2268. Wilson, F. P. "Some English Mock Prognostications." *Library*, XIX (1938), 6-43.

2269. Wilson, Robert H. *Characterization in Malory: a Comparison with his Sources*. Chicago diss. University of Chicago Libraries, 1934.

2270. ——— "Malory, the Stanzaic *Morte Arthur*, and the *Morte Artu*." *MP*, XXXVII (1939), 125-138.

2271. Wilson, R. M. "More Lost Literature in Old and Middle English." [Breton lais.] *Leeds Studies*, v (1936), 25-26.

2272. ——— *Early Middle English Literature*. London: Methuen, 1939.

2273. Wolege, Brian. "Les Manuscrits du *Petit Artus de Bretagne*." *Romania*, LXIII (1937), 393-397.

2274. Wolff, Werner. "Grundsätzliches zu einer Ausgabe des Jüngereren Titrel." *ZDA*, LXXVI (1939), 64-113.

2275. Wolfram von Eschenbach Bund. *Mitteilungen*. See Richter, Jul. and Engel, Wilhelm.

2276. ——— *Satzung*. Würzburg: Wolfram von Eschenbach Bund, 1936.

1754. Wright, Elizabeth M. "Sir Gawain and the Green Knight." Continued in *JEGP*, XXXV (1936), 313-320.

2277. ———. "Additional Notes on *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*." *JEGP*, xxxviii (1939), 1-22.

1757. Wyld, Henry Cecil. "Studies in the Diction of Layamon's *Brut*." Continued in *Language*, xiii (1937), 28-59; 194-237.

2278. Young, Jean. "Two of the Irish 'Mirabilia' in *The King's Mirror*." *Études celtiques*, iii, 5 (1938), 21-26.

1762. Zettl, Ewald. *The Anonymous Short English Metrical Chronicle*. 1935.

Additional reviews by Eilert Ekwall in *Engl. Studies*, xix (1937), 218-221; by Simeon Potter in *MLR*, xxxi (1936), 559-561.

1764. Zinno, Donato. *Le Lay du trot* should have been credited to E. Margaret Grimes.

2279. Zons, Franz Bernhard. *Von der Auffassung der Gebärde in der mittelhochdeutschen Epik*. [Includes Veldeke, Hartmann, Gottfried, and Wolfram.] Münster diss., 1934.

INDEX

- Abraham bar Chija, 1855
 Aesthetics and literary criticism, 604,
 1429, 1800, 1813, 1814, 1824, 1826,
 1851, 1891, 1899, 1911, 1932, 1971,
 1989, 2014, 2030, 2119, 2151, 2160,
 2248, 2257, 2269, 2279.
 Albigenes, 1456.
 Alfred, King, 1777.
 Alexander, 2004.
Amadis de Gaula, 2003, 2006.
 Andreas Capellanus, 1893a, 2187, 1764.
 Aneurin, 1846, 1960, 2022, 2260.
 Anfortas, 1932.
 Anglo-Norman literature, 1682, 2258.
Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 1825.
 Annonay MS, 2103.
 Antioch, Chalice of, 922.
 Arabic influences, 2051, 2056, 2057,
 2067, 2093, 1376, 2094, 2105.
 Ariosto, 1832.
 Arnold, Matthew, 1840, 2124.
 Art, 2037, 2122.
Arthur and Merlin, 2175.
 Arthur, King, 1780, 1811, 1825, 1850,
 1853, 1876, 1920, 2064, 2101, 2114,
 2115, 2124, 2158, 2189, 2213, 2220,
 2265.
Arthur and Gorlagon, 1806.
 Arthurian battlefields, see Battlefields
 and Badon Hill.
 Arthurian romance, 1414, 1514, 1518,
 1549, 1682, 1696, 1810, 1828, 1865,
 1866, 1872, 1889, 1903, 1931, 1946,
 1949, 1955, 1959, 1969, 1982, 1986,
 1987, 2032, 2033, 2037, 2038, 2039,
 2076, 2077, 2083, 2091, 2099, 2104,
 2113, 2124, 2125, 2136, 2155, 2156,
 2199, 2204, 2225, 2267, 2272.
 Arts of Love, 1790, 1887, 2007. See
 also Andreas Capellanus.
Artus de Bretagne, 2041, 2273.
 Atlantis, 1818.
 Avalon, 1818, 2035, 2203, 2231.
Avowing of King Arthur, 2230.
Awntyrs off Arthure, 1950.
 Badon Hill, 1825, 1966, 2192, 2213.
 Baudemaguz, 2034.
 Battlefields, Arthurian, 1825, 2197.
 See Badon Hill.
 Beaumains, 2040.
 Béroul, 1880, 2214.
 Beverus, Johannes, 1928.
 Bibliography, 1696, 1778, 1931, 1414,
 1947, 1949, 2026, 2038, 2075, 2077,
 2124.
Bisclaveret, 1838.
 Bledfri, 2263.
 Boiardo, 1832, 1834.
 Bran, 1992, 1995, 2022, 2087, 2088.
 Bruts, 759, 1928. See Wace and Laya-
 mon.
Brut Chronicle, 1823, 2009, 2112,
 2152, 2185. *Munich Brut*, 1804a.
Brut y Brenhinedd, 1968, 2020,

2100. *Brut Tysilio*, 2019. *Brut y Tywysogion*, 2214.
 Brychan, 1957, 2221.
- Caradoc of Llancarvan, 2217.
 Catalogue Entries, 1998.
 Catalonia, 2099.
 Catgualoph, 1917. See Wallop.
 Cartharism, 2006, 2144, 2224.
 Catterick, 1846.
 Cave legends, 1775, 1791, 1991, 2202, 2259.
 Caxton, William, 2185.
 Celtic, 1042, 1789, 1860, 2123, 2200, 2206, 2225. See Irish, Welsh, Cornish.
 Cerdic of Wessex, 1825, 1966.
 Chaucer, Geoffrey, 2035, 2157.
 Chestre, Thomas, 1877.
 China, 2234.
 Chivalry, 1799, 1800, 1812, 1870, 1872, 1934, 1972, 1973, 1982, 1986, 1987, 1997, 2014, 2039, 2078, 2079, 2081, 2082, 2122, 2155, 2174, 2223.
 Chrétien de Troyes, 759, 760, 1842, 1926, 1944, 1989, 2012, 2015, 2060, 2122, 2154, 2223.
Erec, 2087, 2103, 2179. Cligès, 1944, 2059, 2103. *Knight of the Cart*, 2034, 2179, 2210, 2211, 2241. *Percheval*, 1076, 1895, 1978, 2110, 2257.
 Christianity, 2042, 2228.
 Chronicles, 1762, 2185.
 Cornish legends, 1861, 1861a.
Coronemens Loois, 2016.
 Costumes, 1808.
 Coludes Burh, 1847.
 Courtly epic, 1814, 2014, 2122.
 Courtly love, 1376, 1790, 1800, 1887, 1893a, 1923, 1975, 2007, 2018, 2051, 2056, 2061, 2062, 2093, 2094, 2105, 2120, 2124, 2142, 2144, 2233, 2258.
 Courts of love, 1979, 2142.
- Demoiselle à la Mure*, 2017, 2097.
De Nugis Curialium, 1856, 2031.
 Dante, 1797, 1837, 1878, 1906, 1911, 2134.
 Dating Arthurian works, 2016, 2022, 2033, 2036, 2216, 2219, 2260.
 Dialogue, 1800.
 Diarmuid and Grainne, 1993.
 Dramatic versions, 1885, 2039, 2074.
 Dream vision, 1518, 2018, 2061b.
 Dutch literature, 1806. See *Walcwein*.
- Earthly paradise, 2004.
 Ebraucus, 1957.
- Eilhart von Oberge, 1845, 2124, 2248.
 Eleanor of Aquitaine, 1979, 2142.
Eliduc, 1833, 2055.
 Enanchet, 1887, 1893a.
Eneas, 1942.
 English romances, 1877, 2004, 2031.
 See also individual entries.
 Eochaid Aingces, 2098.
Estoire des Bretuns, 1804a.
 Estrildis, 2215.
 Etain, 1807.
 Ethics, 1973, 2181, 2182.
 Eucharist, 2138.
 Eufemia ballads, 2150a.
 Excalibur, 1836, 2022, 2028, 2189.
- Family in romances, 2165.
 Feirefiz, 1951, 1976.
Flamenca, 2062.
 Flemish *Percheval*, 1901, 2061b.
Folie Tristan, 1943.
 Folk Lore, and folk custom, 1368, 1848, 1872, 1945, 2058, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2123, 2178, 2193, 2201, 2265.
 French medieval romances, 1865, 1903, 2063, 2069, 2104, 2136. See also individual entries.
 Freidank, 2118.
- Gaimar, 1804, 1804a.
 Gawain, 1974, 2035, 2040, 2048, 2124.
Gawain and the Green Knight, 1776, 1801, 1843, 1882, 1893, 1906, 2001, 2029, 2049, 2106, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2277.
 Geoffrey of Monmouth, 759, 2019, 2036, 2053, 2188, 2205.
Historia, 1777, 1795, 1884, 1927, 1930, 1957, 1958, 2075, 2101, 2178, 2215, 2216, 2218. *Prophecies*, 1874, 1919, 1929. *Vita Merlini*, 1964, 2007.
 Geraint, Gerent, 1861, 2235.
 Gerbert of Montreuil, 2089.
 German Middle Ages, 1794, 1912, 1988, 2005, 2078, 2079, 2081, 2082, 2170.
 German medieval romances, 1808, 1812, 1813, 1830, 1886, 1889, 1899, 1900, 1912, 1924, 1945, 1959, 1971, 1982, 1986, 1987, 1518, 2160, 2166, 604.
 Gildas, 1825, 1898, 2207.
 Giraldus Cambrensis, 2214.
 Glastonbury, 1815, 1816, 1861a, 2173, 2203.
 Gododdin, see Aneurin.
 Goidels, 2096.
Golagros and Gawaine, 2004.
Gorboduc, 2253.
 Gottfried von Strassburg, 1794, 1900,

- 1938, 1939, 1983, 1988, 2086, 2151, 2279. *Tristan*, 696, 894, 1934, 1939, 1972, 2052, 2065, 2124.
- Grail, 1456, 1478, 1797, 1821, 1822, 1829, 1837, 1848, 1859, 1869, 1878, 1879, 1905, 1907, 1921, 1998, 2045, 2058, 2092, 1456, 2124, 2134, 2135, 2172, 2256.
- See Chrétien, Wolfram, *Quest of the Holy Grail*, Chalice of Antioch.
- Grail Knight, 1914.
- Grail Mountain, 1905, 2013, 2107.
- Grants Geanz*, 1823, 2009.
- Green Knight, 1994. See *Gauvain and the Green Knight*.
- Guinevere, 1967, 2211, 2265.
- Hagiography, 1781, 1806, 1855, 1861, 2123, 2217, 2219, 2245.
- Hakewell, 2267.
- Hartmann von Aue, 1781, 1794, 1824, 1870, 1888, 1900, 1922, 1926, 1985, 2086, 2154, 1588, 2166, 2209, 2233, 2279.
- Erec*, 1888, 1894, 1988, 1999, 2011, 2027, 2129, 2155, 2177. *Iwein*, 1888, 1922, 2010, 2177.
- Heinrich von Freiburg, 2232.
- Heinrich von Veldeke, 1900, 1970, 2061a, 2161, 2279.
- Hengist and Horsa, 2072.
- Historical backgrounds, 1184, 1762, 1844, 1890, 1892, 1898, 1917, 1936, 1941, 1961, 1965, 1966, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2096, 2101, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2164, 2168, 2178, 2185, 2192, 2196, 2197, 2202, 2207, 2208, 2213, 2252.
- Hugo von Trimberg, 1819, 2118, 2146.
- Iceland, 1514.
- Iconography, 1782, 1925, 2037, 2102, 2122. See *Modena Sculpture*.
- Ignauze*, 2012.
- Index of folk-lore motives, 1638.
- Irish, 1807, 1993, 2061, 2126, 2150, 2179, 2231, 2278.
- Iseult legend, 1862. See *Tristan*.
- Italian, 1820, 1821, 1822, 1832, 1834, 2085, 2143.
- Ivain, Iwein, 1926.
- Jaufré*, 2110.
- Johan üz dem Virgiere*, 2163.
- Johann von Würzburg, 1803.
- John the Baptist, 2022, 2141.
- John the Evangelist, 1855.
- Jones, T. Gwynn, 2240.
- Joseph of Arimathea, 1861a.
- Jüngere Titurel*, 2274.
- Kaw of Pictland, 1965.
- Kay, 1967, 2265.
- Kentigern, St., 1806.
- King Lear, 2152.
- King of Tars*, 1951.
- King's household, 1795.
- King's Mirror*, 2278.
- Kiot, 1895, 2000.
- Konrad von Würzburg, 2119.
- Kurvenal, 1980.
- Lady of the Fountain, 2190.
- Lai du Trot*, 1764.
- Lailoken, 1964.
- Lais, 1877, 2085, 2271. See *Marie de France*.
- Lancelot, 1806. *Lancelot du Lac*, 1956.
- Dutch *Lancelot*, 1806, 1901. See Chrétien and Ulrich von Zatzihoven.
- Latin tradition in epic, 1831.
- Lainfal*, see Thomas Chestre.
- Layamon, 1757, 1937, 2124, 2139, 2239.
- Libeaus Desconus, 1877.
- Libro de Buen Amor*, 1790, 2007.
- Linguistic studies, 1757, 1803, 1845, 1858, 1900, 1904, 1910, 1950, 2020, 2024, 2025, 2111, 2117, 2127, 2139, 2140, 2212, 2230.
- Ludd and Llevelis*, 2198, 2238.
- Lohengrin, 1914, 2000.
- Longinus, 1829.
- Love dialogue, 1800.
- Lug, 1992.
- Lybeaus Desconus*, 1877.
- Mabinogion*, 2127, 2150, 2190, 2191. See *Ludd and Llevelis*.
- Magnus Maximus, 2101, 2208.
- Malory, 1785, 1787, 1795, 1840, 1916, 2040, 2124, 2228, 2237, 2242, 2269, 2270.
- Manuscripts, 1805, 1822, 1867, 1884, 1916, 1919, 2050, 2060, 2075, 2137, 2140, 2153, 2273. Manuscript Texts, 1887, 2052, 2100, 2103, 2112, 2137, 2242.
- Winchester Manuscript, 1916, 2242. See *Palaeography*.
- Map, Walter, 2053. *De Nugis*, 1856, 2031.
- Margaret, St., 1781.
- Marie de France, 1841, 1096, 1942, 2015. *Bisclaveret*, 1838. *Eliduc*, 1833, 2055.

- Marriage in romances, 1912, 1923, 2165.
 Melwas, 1967, 2265.
 Merlin, 1836, 1875, 1876, 1963, 2112, 2196, 2200, 2201. *Prophecies*, 816, 1826, 1827, 1828, 1919, 2050.
 See Robert de Borron, Geoffrey of Monmouth, Richard of Ireland, and *Arthur and Merlin*.
 Metrical forms, 759, 1851, 2002, 2161.
 Middle class in romances, 2113.
 Milton, John, 1184, 1890, 1892, 1898, 2070, 2124.
 Mirabilia, 1908, 2278.
Mirror for Magistrates, 1885.
 Modena Sculpture, 2033, 2036, 2037.
 Montsalvat, 1905. See Wildenberg.
 Montsegur, 1905.
 Morgante, 2143.
 Moritz von Craon, 1935.
 Morris, William, 2028, 2124.
Morte Arthur, alliterative, 1916, 2124, 2162, stanzaic, 2124, 2270. *Morte Artu*, 2270, *Morte le Roi Artu*, 1820, 1896, 1897.
 Moytura, Battle of, 2179.
Mule sanz Fraín, 2174.
 Mythology, 1042, 1992, 1994, 1995, 2115, 2198, 2200, 2206.
 Names, 1811, 2235.
 Nennius, 1283, 1728, 1825, 1908, 1961, 2019, 2124, 2246, 2247, 2261, 2262.
 Norse translation, 1927.
 Numbers, 2065, 2066.
 Obilot, 2180.
 Odenwald, 1792. See Wildenberg.
 Odin, 1992.
 Odysseus, 1948.
 Onomasticon, 912.
 Ovid, 2007.
Owl and Nightingale, 1955.
 Paen de Maisieres, 2174.
 Palaeography, 1884, 1910, 1936, 2050.
Partenopeus, 2053.
 Partholon, 1040, 2068, 2229.
 Parzival, Perceval, 1783, 1802, 1914, 1948, 2045, 2058, 2181, 2182, 1690, 2256. Dutch *Perceval*, 1901. See Chrétien, Wolfram, and Ulrich Fœttr.
 Paving tiles, 1925.
 Pearl, 1776.
 Peasants, 1794, 2063, 2118.
Perlesvaus, 1835, 1858, 1996, 2089, 2090, 2137, 2138, 2140, 2141, 2158, 2264, 2266.
 Polydore Vergil, 1936.
 Portuguese, 2003.
 Poverty and riches, 1830.
 Prophecies, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1919, 1963, 2268. *Prophecy of the Eagle*, 2021.
 See Merlin, Geoffrey of Monmouth, Richard of Ireland.
 Provencal lyric, 1788.
Quest of the Holy Grail, 1821, 1835, 1836, 2145, 2179.
 Renart, Jean, 760a.
 Renaut, 2012.
 Renner, Der, 1819, 2146.
 Richard, King, 1853.
 Richard of Ireland, *Prophecies*, 816, 1826, 1827, 1828, 2050.
 Robert de Boron, 1836, 1978.
 Robinson, E. A., 1840, 1947, 2026, 2124.
 Roman Britain, 1825, 1844, 2071, 2073, 2213.
Rota Veneris, 1893a.
 Saints, see Gerent, John, Kentigern, Margaret, Hagiology.
 Saxon conquest, 1825, 1844, 1941, 2071, 2164.
Sege of Troye, 1946.
 Segramor, 2046.
 Sir Gawain, see Gawain.
 Sir Orfeo, 1856, 1857, 2031.
Sir Tristram, 2117. See Tristan.
 Sir Yvaine, see Ivain.
 Social problems, 1830, 1886, 1912, 1913, 1924, 1934, 1945, 1972, 2063, 2118, 2146, 2165, 2166.
 Spenser, Edmund, 1780, 1918, 2121, 2124, 2191, 2195, 2212, 2227, 2254.
 Stricker, Der, 1794.
 Swan Knight, 1914, 2000.
 Swinburne, A. C., 1840, 2124.
Táin Bó Fraich, 2126.
Tavola Rotonda, 1822.
 Tennyson, Alfred, 1840, 2124, 2240.
 Thomas of Britain, 894, 1682, 1860, 2047, 2258.
 Thomasin von Zirclara, 2118.
 Thovez, Enrico, *Tristano*, 2043, 2044.
Titarel, Jüngerer, 2274.
Tochmarc Etaine, 1807.

- Topography, 1843, 1846, 1847, 1850, 1917, 1961, 2190, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2197, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2220.
 See Arthurian battlefields, Catterick, Coludes Burh, Catguoloph.
Tractatus de Bruto, 1928.
 Transmission of legends, 2032.
 Tristan, 1778, 1782, 1789, 1796, 1809, 1840, 1868, 1902, 1915, 1920, 1993, 2052, 2054, 2055, 2080, 2084, 2085, 2214, 2251. *Folie Tristan*, 1943. Prose *Tristan*, 2153. *Sir Tristram*, 2117. *Tristrant und Isalde*, 1839. See Bérout, Thomas of Britain, Heinrich von Freiburg.
 Troubadours, 1788, 2094, 2108, 912, 2243, 2244, 2094.
 Tyrffing, 2028.
 Ulrich Füetrer, 1817, 1933, 2109.
 Ulrich von dem Türin, 2111.
 Ulrich von Türheim, 1954.
 Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, 2133, 2226, 2249.
 Uther, 2101.
 Vergil, 1583, 2254.
 Vergil, Polydore, 1936.
 Victorian literature, 2124, 2251.
 Vortigern, 1825, 2112, 2213.
 Wace, 1786, 1883, 1953, 2050, 2124.
 Wagner, Richard, 1862, 1909, 1981, 2124, 2186. *Lohengrin*, 1909. *Tristan and Isolde*, 1408, 1852, 1862, 1873, 1909, 1939, 1980, 2023, 2080. *Parsifal*, 1909.
 Wales, 2188-2198, 2201-2206, 2220, 2221, 2222.
Walewein, 1863, 1969, 2061b.
 Wallop, 1962. See Catguoloph.
 Walter of Oxford, 2053.
 Walther von der Vogelweide, 1938.
 Wauchier de Denain, *Perceval*, 2004.
 Weapons, 1780, 1836, 1854, 1940, 2005. See Excalibur.
 Welsh, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1919, 1967, 1968, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2040, 2098, 2127, 2240, 2265. Welsh Manuscripts, 1805, 2075. Welsh *Bruts*, 2020, 2021, 2100. See *Mabinogion*, Lady of the Fountain, *Lludd and Llevelis*, Aneurin.
 Wildenberg, 1871, 1952, 2013.
 Winchester, 2095. Winchester, manuscript, 1916, 2242.
 Wirnt von Gravenberc, *Wigalais*, 1798, 2010.
 Wolfram von Eschenbach, 1781, 1784, 1792, 1793, 1794, 1824, 1870, 1881, 1900, 1911, 1913, 1938, 1952, 1977, 1990, 2066, 2078, 2086, 2124, 2129, 2159, 2165, 1549, 2167, 2233, 2234, 2279. *Titarel*, 1904. *Parsifal*, 1779, 1802, 1849, 1855, 1864, 1867, 1895, 1910, 1951, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1984, 1988, 2000, 2002, 2008, 2027, 2030, 2042, 2045, 2046, 1549, 2167, 2169, 2171, 2172, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2250, 2256, 2257.
 Women in romances, 1923, 2165.
 Yvain, 1782, 1926. See Chrétien de Troyes.
Yvain and Gawaine, 2024, 2025.
 Zobel von Connelant, 1894, 1999.

RECENT TRENDS IN ENGLISH LINGUISTICS

By ARTHUR G. KENNEDY

The past few decades have seen an impressive amount of important accomplishment in English linguistics. I cannot hope, of course, to do more than touch upon a few phases of this advancement in the brief space at my command; but I will attempt to discuss at least six phases of recent linguistic history and suggest what seem to me some of their important features and trends. For the purposes of this discussion I shall interpret "recent" as the period after 1900.

Because we are apt to think of English philology, in its broader meaning, as an old and long established subject, it may be well to call attention to the fact that if we add a comparable period of forty years before 1900, the entire resulting span of eighty years, from 1860 to the present year, will include most of the important innovations in English philological study, the establishment of the subject as a field for serious research, the introduction and definition of many terms, and the adoption of new classifications, and of new attitudes toward the use and study of our language.

Among the most significant illustrations of what I have just said are the phoneme, the morpheme, and the semanteme. After arguing for some decades about the individual and presumably exact characters of certain speech sounds, we seem to have gradually concluded that it is convenient to recognize that there are variations within limited areas, as regards the pronunciation of words and certain assumed sounds within those words. These areas of phonetic variability have been named *phonemes*, and the latest edition of Webster's *New International Dictionary* defines the phoneme as: "A group of variants of a speech sound, usually all spelled with the same or equivalent letter and commonly regarded as the same sound, but varying somewhat with the same speaker according to different phonetic conditions (neighboring sounds, stress, length, intonation, etc.)." It is interesting to note that in the Webster of 1909 the word was placed below the line, was marked "rare," and defined as "a phone." In Vol. VII of the *New English Dictionary*, which is also dated 1909, the phoneme is likewise labeled "rare" and given as a synonym of *phone*. Even in the Supplement of 1933 there is no additional treatment of the word. In the *Century Dictionary and Cyclopedia* of 1906 the word *phoneme* is not entered at all, and in the

Standard Dictionary even as late as 1924 the word is wanting. One of the earliest attempts to give currency to this idea of phonemic groups in this country was the article of Edward Sapir on "Sound Patterns in Language," which appeared in the first volume of the new periodical *Language*, in June, 1925. During the subsequent fourteen years, but more especially after about the year 1934, numerous articles and books have been devoted to defining the phonemic principle and examining the range of variable sounds covered by the term. The whole matter is still so fresh and controversial that I shall not attempt to go beyond the presentation of the general principle as set forth in the definition quoted above.

The use of the word *morpheme* seems to show a desire on the part of modern philologists for a general term which can be utilized in discussions of the so-called "grammatical properties" (gender, number, person, case, tense, mood, voice, and comparison), without committing the speaker to any one kind of morphological or syntactical method of indicating such properties. Until quite recently "formal grammar" has been much emphasized in the teaching of our language, but with a growing realization on the part of many grammarians that too much stress has been laid on inflectional form in modern English, and not enough on syntactical usage. Even as late as 1925 one of my graduate students, Dr. Wallace Vickers, found that in the use of the term *case*, for example, the grammarians of the preceding century and earlier had been about equally divided between form and use in their definitions of the term. Professor Curme, in his 1935 volume on "Parts of Speech and Accidence," took the bull by the horns and courageously, even if not altogether satisfactorily, defined *accidence* as "the study of the inflection and order of words, i.e., the change of form and order in words to indicate the part they play in the sentence."¹ A little later others have attempted to introduce the term *morpheme*, but have set it alongside and coördinate with inflectional form, making it mean all those phrasal substitutes for inflection which we commonly employ to indicate the properties and relations of words in sentences. It is only when we go to the 1934 edition of Webster's *Dictionary* that we get a definition of *morpheme* which includes all methods of expressing the grammatical properties. Here we are told that a morpheme is "An element or property of language showing the relations between nouns, verbs, adjectives, and concrete adverbs. It may be a prefix or suffix (John's), a preposition, conjunction, relation adverb, auxiliary or copulative verb, intonation, accentuation, an ablaut

¹ Curme and Kurath, *A Grammar of the English Language* (Boston, Heath & Co., 1935), II, 109.

variation, or an order of words." But even yet it will be noted that the morpheme is nowhere defined as the complete inflected word or entire equivalent phrase, but rather it is presented as the assisting device by which the grammatical properties or relations of words themselves are indicated. It is not yet conceived of as the entire area of usage; it is merely an aid within the area.

It is obvious, however, that we have come a long way toward a clearer conception of one of the fundamental idiomatic features of the English language of today. Morpheme does not occur at all in the Webster of 1909, nor in the Century of 1906, the Standard of 1924, or even in the *New English Dictionary*, original or supplementary. If one can judge from an article published as late as 1938 on "Archimorpheme and Phonomorpheme,"² we shall have many a headache before the grammarians, more particularly the philosophical linguists, succeed in straightening out the matter of definition. But I believe it is safe to assume that just as the phoneme is a variable and somewhat inexact and unstable phonetic unit, likewise in the morphological and syntactical part of language the morpheme is a variable and flexible unit of expression.

In attempting to summarize the use of the third term in this group, namely, *semanteme*, I have found no better concise presentation of the matter than the statement of Vendryes, in the chapter on "Words and Morphemes" in his book on *Language* (translated in 1925). He says, "By *semantemes* we understand the linguistic elements which express the ideas of the concepts (répresentations); in this case, the idea of the horse, or the idea of running; and by *morpheme* we understand those elements which express the connexions between the ideas."³ In the newest Webster the *semanteme* is "An element of language that expresses a definite image or idea, as contrasted with the elements (called morphemes) that relate and connect these images in sentences; a notional word."

In the Webster of a quarter-century earlier, as in the other leading English dictionaries of that day, no trace of the word *semanteme* can be found. Even now I should say that we have not yet reached the point in English linguistic study where we feel generally the need of stressing seriously and finally this broad distinction between the *semantemes* as the notional words of language and the *morphemes* as the servants of the *semantemes*. Such a distinction, it is true, takes care of a language very neatly and comprehensively, and prob-

² C. E. Bazell, "'Archimorpheme' and 'Phonomorpheme,'" *MLN*, LIII (1938), 363-6.

³ J. Vendryes, *Language. A Linguistic Introduction to History*, Transl. by Paul Radin (N.Y., Knopf, 1925), p. 74.

ably it will prove useful and satisfying to the philosophically-minded grammarian. But it may prove too difficult a distinction, and the herding together of too many different kinds of linguistic phenomena, to be worth while for the ordinary practical grammarian. Moreover, if we insisted on going through our entire grammatical system and segregating the various kinds of morphemes from the more notional semantemes, it would amount to merely a redealing of the cards, a new method of classifying old materials, and it would not change the character of the English language or materially simplify the teaching of it.⁴

When I began my graduate study in the autumn of 1904, I took a course in theoretical phonetics in which we utilized a newly published Report of a Joint Committee representing the National Education Association, the American Philological Association, and the Modern Language Association of America on the Subject of a Phonetic English Alphabet, which report I now realize was an important milestone in the progress of phonetic study in this country. This report was mainly the work of five men, all of whom have had an important part in the history of American linguistics, namely, Calvin Thomas, George Hempl, Charles P. G. Scott, O. F. Emerson, and E. O. Vaile. In this report attention was called to the earlier work leading to the formulation of the phonetic alphabet which had been recommended by the American Philological Association in 1877, and later courageously introduced in the *Standard Dictionary* (1893-4). The proposed alphabet of 1904 was based upon that of 1877, but offered various additions and improvements. Of its recommendations, however, at least ten have been materially changed in the years since, some letters dropped, others given different values. In the report, it is interesting to note, only very casual reference was made to the work of the International Phonetic Association, although its aims were in general approved and even expressed in some measure among those of the Joint Committee. But it is true, I believe, that in the decades following the report, three lines of promotion of scientific respelling can be observed, namely, in the more general use of

⁴ I might remark that the philological world appears to be threatened with an *-emic* scourge of what has been aptly termed orismological sesquipedalianism, which conceivably might leave the philologists in just as pernicious an-emia as the educational specialists are at present afflicted with. I have recently encountered the *enthymeme*, the *glosseme*, the *grapheme*, the *noeme*, the *philosopheme*, the *tagmeme*, and the *taxeme*, as well as the *archimorpheme* and *phonomorpheme*, already mentioned, and one can sympathize mildly, perhaps, with C. L. Wrenn's remark in the 1937 volume of *The Year's Work in English Studies* (p. 31), that to turn to another subject was "refreshing, after all this scientific jargon of *phoneme* and *phonology*—and there are those who would add to our terminology *morphemes* and *taxemes*, and even *morphonemes* and *tonemes*."

such spelling in classroom teaching of language, in the publication of numerous articles and books about the subject by individual linguists, and in the steady growth and use of the alphabet of the International Phonetic Association. It is possible to mention here only a few landmarks in the recent progress of this phase of linguistic study.

In 1909, in his *Modern English*, George Philip Krapp employed a phonetic alphabet which was "a slightly modified form of that recommended in the *Report of a Joint Committee*"; but in 1919, in his *Pronunciation of Standard English in America*, he says, "The phonetic alphabet is that of the International Phonetic Association, with several modifications." In 1914, Professor Bloomfield, in his *Introduction to the Study of Language*, adopted the alphabet of the International Phonetic Association as "the standard one"; but in his new edition of 1933 he has reflected a growing tendency among teachers of practical linguistics to avoid excessive analysis of speech sounds by employing a restricted, and somewhat arbitrary, set of phonetic symbols designed to express phonemes only. In the Copenhagen Conference of April, 1925, if one might venture to summarize the results it would be to the effect that so many phoneticians came to offer their own "several modifications" that the only agreements that could be reached were on certain general principles. And yet, even though most phoneticians have been inclined to urge certain individual departures from the IPA alphabet, the English speaking world has advanced so far in this matter of phonetic transcription that when the monumental Second Edition of Webster's *New International Dictionary* appeared in 1934, in the very anteroom of this conservative old institution sat ensconced this same IPA alphabet, waiting apparently to be summoned to the sanctum sanctorum to serve some future edition. And it is not inconceivable that if another quarter century brings another new edition, it will be a feature of the dictionary itself; for with the present strong tendency to emphasize the phoneme as a practical, flexible, phonetic unit, there is also a demand for a simple fundamental phonetic alphabet which will serve the needs of the ordinary student of English.

A reform of English spelling has seemed to many competent students of our language an important desideratum, and it is interesting to note that both in 1877 and in 1904 the men who were promoting a phonetic alphabet were also concerned with movements for spelling reform. At first there were many who would go so far as to recommend complete phonetic spelling as a solution of our problem, and it has been, I believe, only during the last few decades

that thoughtful reformers have come to recognize more fully the almost insuperable obstacles to such a sweeping change in our system as substitution of a complete phonetic alphabet would involve. Even as recently as 1904 the Joint Committee that I have already discussed said in their Report, "And there is another need on the opposite side—that of a simplified alphabet for easy phonetic writing and practical spelling reform" (p. 16).

When the Simplified Spelling Board was organized about 1906, with the financial support of Andrew Carnegie and the enthusiastic coöperation of numerous influential men such as Theodore Roosevelt, it seemed that much permanent improvement might be made in the course of the next few decades. But enthusiasm outran discretion, too many changes were urged in too short a time, and the movement soon lost momentum and lapsed into a state of indecision and discouragement. The discouragement was due, I think, not so much to the opposition of the "ignorant and stubborn educated" against whom Lounsbury railed as to the great difficulties that would naturally be experienced by publishers, stenographers, teachers, and all writers and users of the present well entrenched system of spelling the English language. When the activities of the Simplified Spelling Board culminated in a *Handbook of Simplified Spelling* in 1920, the list of reformed spellings offered had become so formidable that one glance at the thousands of simplifications was sufficient to discourage most students of the English language. And when the periodical *Spelling* was launched in 1925, with the coöperative backing of the Simplified Spelling Board, the British Simplified Spelling Society, and the older Spelling Reform Association, representing ideals ranging all the way from a few mild improvements to a sweeping adoption of the scientific phonetic alphabet, it was possible to do little more than the Copenhagen Conference did in the case of the IPA, namely, set forth the general principles that various conflicting groups were able to agree upon, with an irreducible minimum of simplifications which might be acceptable to the generality of English spellers.

The practical difficulties that were encountered by the advocates of spelling reform are easily comprehensible, and the inertia that confronted an over-enthusiastic body of scholars and workers need not surprise any informed student of English linguistics. But it is hard to understand how so many able students of our language could go so blindly about the task of upsetting our present system when they had no detailed and fundamental history of the spelling of the past on which to base their recommendations. Brander Matthews was content to remark in the fourth *Circular* of the American Sim-

plified Spelling Board in 1906 that "It is greatly to be regretted that no scholar has written a full 'History of English Orthography,' the record of our ever-shifting spellings"; and W. W. Skeat in 1908 initiated the *Pamphlets* of the British Simplified Spelling Society with a very superficial eight-page tract on *The History of Spelling*. It is only quite recently that students of English have begun to make careful and detailed studies of important phases of the history of English spelling, and, to our shame, they have been foreign, chiefly German, students. Since 1917, studies of the digraphs *ou*, *oa*, *ea*, *ie*, and *ee* have been published by Marcus, Reinhold, Umpfenbach, Grosse, and Weiss⁵; and when a few more shall have been completed, it is to be hoped that someone will undertake the challenging task of organizing the wealth of material and interpreting the spelling practices of Englishmen of the past, and the more immediate present. Only then, when a history is at hand, can we go intelligently about the business of trimming and pruning our system of spelling.

The recent introduction of the concept of the morpheme as an important recognition of numerous syntactical elements in modern English idiomatic usage seems to me an appropriate culmination of a rich and varied study of English syntactical practice during the past half-century. Unless one has had his attention centered closely on the trend away from emphasis on morphology toward syntax during this period, he can scarcely appreciate fully the shift in attitude that has taken place since 1900. An illuminating measure of this shift can be found in the historical grammars of Henry Sweet and Otto Jespersen. In 1892 and 1898 Sweet published the two volumes of his *New English Grammar*, a fat one on phonology and accidence, and a very thin one on syntax; but since 1909 Jespersen has brought out four volumes of his *Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*, with one, only, on sounds and spellings, and three, already, on syntax. Of the great collections of Kruisinga and Poutsma, most of the material is concerned primarily with syntax; even in the publication of the three-volume work of Curme and Kurath, the volume devoted to syntax has been given precedence in publication.

I can take time for only a few general comments on the steps in this increased study of English syntax.

When Sweet used the term *conversion* in his *New English Grammar*, in 1892, he was one of the first grammarians to employ

⁵ Hans Marcus, *Die Schreibung ou in frühe. Handschriften* (Berlin diss. 1917); C. A. Reinhold, "Neuenglisch ou (ow) und seine Geschichte," *Palaestra*, CLXXXIX (1934); Heinz Umpfenbach, "Die oa-Schreibung im Englischen," *Palaestra*, CCI (1935); Eginhard Grosse, "Die neuengl. ea-Schreibung," *Palaestra*, CCVIII (1937); Helmut Weiss, *Die ie- (ee)-Schreibung im Englischen und ihre Geschichte* (Berlin diss. 1937).

the word in its more restricted sense as meaning "change in function or construction." But since the turn of the century, other grammarians have increasingly realized the importance of the practice of shifting a word from one part of speech to another without change in form, and in certain books, such as Kruisinga's *Handbook of Present-Day English*, this idiomatic feature of English has been accorded detailed treatment. It is true that certain other grammarians have impatiently and somewhat shortsightedly attempted to discard the age-old practice of dividing words into the parts of speech and have sought new grounds for classification of our functionally shifting body of words. Usually, however, the usefulness of the old categories has become apparent to the malcontents sooner or later, as a basis for discussion of the very instability of convertible words, if for no other reason; for the most part this newer emphasis on functional change between the parts of speech, and even within the parts themselves, has been increasing, I believe.

In like wise, a dissatisfaction with the classification of the parts of the sentence and a desire for a new logical approach to sentence study led Jespersen to introduce in his first volume on syntax, in 1914, a plan for classifying all elements into three ranks, "according to their mutual relations as defined or defining." But this scheme necessitated an almost complete reshuffling of the cards, grammatically, and one not especially useful to the practical teacher of English grammar; and so the plan has not had much general acceptance. It has given the philosophical student of language a fresh view of the complicated subject of thought expression; but where it has been tried out on the ordinary language student merely because of some dissatisfaction with the status quo of grammatical study, it has probably done more harm than good.

Most important studies in English syntax since 1900, however, have been devoted to an examination and more careful classification of features of idiomatic usage; they have been concerned with matters that are both formal and semasiological, and have undoubtedly paved the way for the culminating *morpheme*. Perhaps my own experience will serve to illustrate the kind of studies that I have in mind. Prior to about 1920 I found much confusion in the study and analysis of the modern English verb. The influence of Latin grammar in England has persisted most stubbornly in the teaching of the English idiom, and while the English verb has never been elaborately inflected, and has lost a good part of what inflection it once had, nevertheless the English grammars and grammarians of the early twentieth century persisted in displaying both the simple and the phrasal verbs in elaborate paradigms or "conjugations." All sorts of

complex verbs were called "compound"—*overtake, sidestep, bring about, shall be, was hurt, was going*. The first two verbs listed are undoubtedly compounds, in the usual sense of the word; and the last three are phrasal verbs that express futurity, passivity, and progressive or continuous action—matters now covered, apparently, by the new term *morpheme*. But the verb *bring about* was sometimes called a compound, sometimes a verb with separable prefix, because of a superficial resemblance to some German verbs, and sometimes it was merely brushed aside as a colloquialism, a verb with a "parasitical preposition," as one semi-learned gentleman expressed it. In 1920 I suggested that such idiomatic Modern English verbs be called "verb-adverb combinations," to distinguish them from the true compounds, and while the term is not altogether satisfactory, the mere introduction of it has, I believe, helped to clear the air somewhat.⁶

But the last one of my phrasal examples, *was going*, a so-called "progressive" or "expanded" verb, accomplishes something which we have never been able to classify satisfactorily as tense, voice, or mood; and as the thoughtful linguist of the more recent past has considered it, he has seen aspects which he had not before attempted to classify. Consequently, within a few decades various linguists have been busy trying to label these "aspects" of English verbs, both simple and phrasal verbs, and to some extent these published studies have, it seems to me, helped to clear the air still more. Perhaps we shall someday find it necessary to include along with the verb properties of tense, mood, voice, person and number, an additional one, aspect.

The growth of interest in the study of semasiology or semantics, "the science of meanings," has come chiefly since Bréal's book was translated into English in the year 1900. It is true that the meanings of words were studied earlier, but the term *semasiology* appears for the first time in America, as far as I can learn, in the *New Englander* of 1860,⁷ and *semantics* about 1895. It is worthy of note that while *semasiology* was preferred in the 1909 edition of Webster's *Dictionary*, in the 1934 edition *semasiology* is defined as '*semantics*,' the latter term receiving the chief attention. I am wondering if, as in the case of phonetics and phonology, these two terms may eventually fit into different niches in our terminology, *semantics* coming to mean the general study of meanings, and *semasiology* being restricted to the semantic study of a single language or period or group. It may be too early to predict; but certainly with our recent

⁶ Arthur G. Kennedy, "The Modern English Verb-Adverb Combination," Stanford University Publications, *Language and Literature*, I (1920).

⁷ J. W. Gibbs, *New Englander*, XVIII (May, 1860), 138.

tendency to use terms more exactly, something is likely to be done about it. Books on the semasiological aspects of English are not numerous yet, though Weekley has published much on the subject, and others like Greenough and Kittredge, McKnight, Barfield, and even Stuart Chase, have contributed to the subject. It does not seem many years since a perplexed library cataloguer asked me how a book on semantics could be fitted into the Dewey decimal system, inasmuch as Dewey had not conceived of the need of a place for such books. And yet, already, the searcher after linguistic vitamins has been able to segregate the *semanteme*, and we shall probably live to see it prescribed for all sorts of ailing courses in linguistics; for while the science of semantics has been slowest to develop, it has most interesting matter to offer the average student of our language.

This superficial survey should conclude with at least a few remarks about the state of linguistic bibliography. When I took my degree in English philology in 1914, and set out to teach the subject, it seemed to me that I was casting in my lot with a most hopeless minority; the older, famous, philologists, like Sweet, Skeat, Furnivall, Maetzner, March and Whitney, had passed away, and most of the younger students in this country seemed to be interested chiefly in the literary study of English. When I published my *Bibliography of Writings on the English Language from the Beginning of Printing to the end of 1922*, no important or comprehensive bibliography had yet been compiled on the subject, and it seemed no great undertaking to bring together materials for such a bibliography. But during the last few decades there has been a most noticeable awakening of scholarly interest in our language. The launching of *Language* and *American Speech* in 1925 encouraged publication in the field of linguistics, and activity in other directions has produced such a multiplicity of writings on the English language that I am fairly awed at the prospects of organizing into a supplement or new edition the materials that I have collected since 1922.

Stanford University

BUSIRANE'S CASTLE AND ARTIDON'S CAVE

By DOROTHY F. ATKINSON

A work hitherto neglected¹ by students of English literary history has recently come to my attention. It is the voluminous romance, *Espeio de Caballerias*.² Begun by the sixteenth century writer, Diego Ortúñez de Calahorra, the romance was carried on by others until it extended to approximately nine hundred folios. It is in the tradition of *Amadis* and *Palmerin*.³

Spenser scholars will be interested in the English translation of this, entitled: *The Mirrour of Princely deedes and Knighthood: Wherein is shewed the worthinesse of the Knight of the Sunne, and his brother Rosicleer, sonnes to the great Emperour Trebetio: with the strange love of the beautifull and excellent Princesse Briana, and the valiant actes of other noble Princes and Knightes, . . .*" This translation was published by Thomas East and others in thirteen editions between 1578 and 1601.⁴ This figure would seem to indicate that the *Mirrour* enjoyed a certain vogue. That it must have done so is evident from East's statement that the first part "was so accepted, that I was importuned by sundry Gentlemen (my very friends) to procure the translation of the seconde part: whereto, (partly to accomplish their desires, and partly for the vulgar delight of all) I condescended. . . ."⁵ Since five of these editions were available during the years when Spenser was composing the first three books of *The Faerie Queene*, it is worth while to consider whether he may have known the *Mirrour*.

¹ But see below, footnote 6.

² *Brit. Mus. Cat.* lists Spanish editions of this in 1583 (first part), 1585 (second part), and 1623 (third and fourth parts).

³ *Enciclopedia Universal Ilustrada* (Barcelona), XL, 792.

⁴ *Short Title Catalogue* lists the following:

Part	Translated by	Date
1	Margaret Tyler.....	1578, 1580 (?), 1599 (?)
2	R.P.....	1585, 1599
3	R.P.....	1586 (?), 1598, 1599 (?)
4-5	R.P.....	1583, 1598
6	R.P.....	1598
7	L.A.....	1598
8	L.A.....	1599
9	L.A.....	1601

⁵ *Mirrour*, parts 4-5 (1583), "Dedication," A ij. All references are to copies at the Henry E. Huntington Library.

Various details in *The Faerie Queene*, ranging from proper names like Briana⁶ and Argante⁷ to whole episodes and characterizations, hint that Spenser knew and used the *Mirroure*. It is the purpose of this study to indicate the nature and extent of Spenser's debt, in Book III, cantos xi and xii, to the first (1578) and second (1585) parts of the *Mirroure*.

II

In Bk. III, cantos xi-xii, Britomart comes upon Scudamore, who lies on the ground (xi, 7-8) grieving at the loss of his lady (9-11). Britomart sympathizes (13-5) and hears his story (16-7). Then together they go to Busirane's castle (20), the entry of which is guarded by enchanted fire (21). Leaving Scudamore to wait, Britomart passes the fire safely (25-6) and enters a room hung with tapestries portraying the Wars of Cupid (29-49). Mystified by this scene and by the inscription, "Be bold," over a door, she waits until night (55). A great storm blows through the house (xii, 1-3); then the Masque of Cupid passes (3-26). In this, Amoret appears, wounded, her heart carried in a basin (19-21). At the next midnight, Britomart enters the enchanted chamber (28-30) and finds Busirane and tortured Amoret (31-33). At Amoret's request (34-36), she spares Busirane's life. Amoret is released from the enchantment and Britomart leads her out, taking Busirane in chains (36-42) with her. In the 1590 text, Scudamore is still waiting (43-5), but in the 1596, he has left in despair.

In the *Mirroure*, Rosicleer, the Knight of Cupid, arrives at Artidon's cave (fol. 15) which is guarded by enchanted fire. He learns the nature of the adventure from an inscription on a rock (15^v) and from a company of shepherds nearby (16-8). After sitting all night under a tree, Rosicleer leaves the shepherds to wait for him and passes safely through the fire (18-9). He slays the Bull. A storm follows (20^v) during which a dragon is born of the Bull. After killing the dragon, Rosicleer discovers his own adventures in the cave portrayed upon one wall (21-22). He enters the galleries, comes to a locked door kept by a giant, and reads the inscription over it. Another storm follows his breaking of this door (22^v-23), but he enters the inner quadran, releases Artidea (24^v),

⁶ C. Bowie Millican, MS Diss., Harvard Univ. (1930), *Studies in Spenser and the Arthurian Legend*, pp. 342-3. Commenting upon Spenser's "selective method" of using his source, Mr. Millican remarks in passing that "it has not heretofore been pointed out, for example, that from Margaret Tyler's translation of the first part of *Especio de Caballerias* Spenser could have found the names of two of his female characters: Briana and Fidelia. . . ."

⁷ H. G. Lottspeich, *Classical Mythology in the Poetry of Edmund Spenser* (Princeton, 1932), 64, suggests that the form "Argante" may be original with Spenser. But actually this form occurs in the 1578 text of the *Mirroure*, p. [9].

and puts some questions to the magician Artidon. Then the shepherds and Prince Luziro enter, having read the new inscription at the cave mouth. The fire still burns (25) and Artidon is left in the cave, as Artidea goes off to marry Luziro.

III

A study of these episodes leads to recognition of three important parallels.⁸

I. Rosicleer was the Knight of Cupid. Some time before he proved the adventure of Artidon's cave, Rosicleer had assumed this name and style.

⁸ Certain further influences of the *Mirroure* upon Spenser's account may be found in the following details. (1) The shepherds had read the inscription at Artidon's cave, which said that "a knight shall come, who with his great bountie and force can overcome the keepers of the entrie heereof" (*Mirroure*, pt. 2, 15^v). They were favorably impressed by Rosicleer's appearance (*ibid.*, 16), but nevertheless their spokesman concluded his account of the cave, "I doe not thinke him to be a wise man that will put himselfe to prove this adventure, for that hetherto ther hath not ben a knight of so much prowes as to conquare the first keeper. . . ." (*ibid.*, 17^v). The shepherds therefore "request him all that they might to leave and . . . not to put himselfe into such perill, for y^e by no meanes he could escape the death, or else to be verie sore hurt" (*ibid.*, 17^v-8. Cf. *FQ*, III, xi, 19 and 23-4). Finally the shepherds promise to wait outside for Rosicleer's return (*ibid.*, 19^v. Cf. *FQ*, xii, 43-5 and the rejected stanzas of 1590). (2) Once inside and past the Bull, Rosicleer discovers a room "paved with couloured bricques, which cast a greate light, and [it] was founded upon great and mightie pillars of marble, round about the court there were galleries mervailouslie wrought and verie faire" (*ibid.*, 20). On a wall in the next room was portrayed "his owne figure and likenesse, with the device of his armour, and the entering into the cave, and all that happened . . . everie thing periculerie as it was, that hee himselfe could not declare it so perfectlie as it did appeare there upon the wall" (*ibid.*, 21^v-22. Cf. *FQ*, xi, 27, 7-9 and 29-49). (3) Artidon and Busirane were superb magicians (*Mirroure*, *loc. cit.*, 16^v and *FQ*, IV, i, 3). Artidon had loved the maiden queen Artidea; in pique at her treatment of his suit, he whisked her out of bed one night and brought her to his cave. She has been his prisoner many years (*ibid.*, 17. Cf. *FQ*, III, xi, 10-11, 16-17). (4) In the *Mirroure* passage there are a number of storms, details of which may have reminded Spenser of the machinery which usually accompanied the enchantment scenes in romance literature. For example, when Artidea was kidnapped, "there was such thundring and lightning, that with the great noyse thereof, they thought verely the whole world would have sonke" (*ibid.*, 17). Again, when Rosicleer slew the dragon, "the Sunne was all darkned, and the heavens: in such, [*sic*] sort that the court was as dark as it had bene at midnight, and upon the same there was great thunderings and lightnings, as it seemed that al that mightie worke would sinke or be overthrowen, . . . but this did not indure long, for likewise upon a sodaine this great tempests of lightnings and thunder did end and vanish awaie, and the daie turned to be verie faire and cleere" (*ibid.*, 20^v). During this storm there issued from the dead Bull's body "a darke and thicke mist, the which did indure a while." Finally, as Rosicleer penetrated to Artidon's inmost room, he "heard a greate and terrible noyse of thunder, that the heavens seemed to open therewith, and in all the kingdome of Russia was heard that terrible noyse, which caused all men to feare and wonder, for that the daie was verie faire and cleere . . ." (*ibid.*, 23. Cf. *FQ*, III, xii, 2 and 3, 1-2; also 27, 1-3 and 37, 1-2).

... he tooke hys armour, wherein was drawn the God of love, in such sort as our auncestors were wont to paynt him, with his eyes out, his bowe and arrowes in his hand: ... and thereupon he tooke his name of that devise, from whiche time he never called himselfe other then the knight of Cupid. . . .⁹

Another passage speaks of him as "carrying upon his sheeld the devise of Cupid, by the which he was knowen and looked on of all people."¹⁰ Other passages could be cited, but these two will suffice here.

Scudamore, who was "Cupids man,"¹¹ carried "the shield of love"

On which the winged boy in colours cleare
Depeinted was, full easie to be knowne,
And he thereby, where ever it in field was showne.¹²

Scudamore later describes the shield:

With that my shield I forth to her did show, . . .
On which when *Cupid* with his killing bow
And cruell shafts emblazoned. . . .¹³

The resemblance between these two shields and between their bearers' titles is striking in itself. But after a rather careful examination of sixteenth and seventeenth century heraldic treatises, I am persuaded that the Knight of Cupid is the original of Scudamore. It is, of course, possible that Spenser may have been describing a real shield thought to have belonged to Sir James Scudamore.¹⁴ If so, it must have been an "emblem" or "imprese" shield, used in tilt or masque, for there is in English heraldry no such blazon as Scudamore's—no Cupid. Sir James's heraldic shield is not with the rest of his armour at the Metropolitan Museum,¹⁵ but it seems hardly likely that it resembled the shield of "Cupids man." Another possibility is that Spenser may have been referring to the motto, "Scuto Amoris Divini," of Sir John Scudamore of Homlacy, Heref. But this coat of arms, reproduced in the first three editions of John Guillim's *Display of Heraldry*,¹⁶ contains no Cupid.

⁹ *Mirroure*, pt. 1 (1578), 156v.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pt. 2 (1585), 158v.

¹¹ *FQ*, IV, x, 54, 7.

¹² *Ibid.*, III, xi, 7, 7-9.

¹³ *Ibid.*, IV, x, 55, 1-4.

¹⁴ *Spenser Variorum*, III, 290.

¹⁵ *Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum*, VIII (1913), 118-23.

¹⁶ John Guillim, *loc. cit.*, London (1610), pp. 271-2; *ibid.*, eds. of 1632 and 1638, p. 415. Sir John Scudamore's "atchievement" is blazoned thus: "Hee beareth foure Coats quarterly, as followeth, viz. The first is Gules, three Stirrops Leathered and buckled Or, for his Paternall Coat, by the name of Scudamore. The second is Azure, two Barres gemewes and a Lion passant, in Chiefe Or, by the name of Tregos. The third is Argent, a Fesse Gules, betweene three Rowels

We do know that Spenser drew upon his acquaintance with the plastic arts, and we should not rule out the possibility that he may be doing so here. But there is as yet no evidence that he ever saw or heard of any actual shield like Scudamore's. In the absence of such evidence, and in view of this remarkable likeness to the *Mirroure* shield, I believe that we must conclude that Rosicleer is the prototype of Scudamore.

The interpretation of Rosicleer's device is made by Arguirosa, who understands from it that the bearer is not a novice in love; he has a lady.¹⁷ A similar interpretation of Scudamore's device is given in the motto which hung below the "shield of love" when Scudamore won it:

Blessed the man that well can use his blis:
Whose ever be the shield, faire Amoret be his.¹⁸

II. Rosicleer suggests also, to a certain extent, the pattern for Britomart at the castle of Busirane. His magnanimity and prowess are pre-eminent, even in the *Mirroure's* galaxy of redoubtable knights. But he is more truly the model of temperate and chaste love. It is his moral quality which enables him to succeed in the love test at the cave. We are told by the shepherds that

. . . All such knights as were in love did enter in thorough the fire, without receiving anie hurt . . . [and] all such knights as did not love, at the houre that they gave y^e enterprise, they felt so great heat & torment, that they were constrained to returne backe again.¹⁹

The *Mirroure* says of Rosicleer, as he entered the fire, "and for that he was so true a servaunt unto Cupid, that mervailous fire did not hurt him anie thing at all. . . ."²⁰ It is quite clear from many passages in the *Mirroure* that being "in love" means being perfectly chaste in the same sense that Britomart was the perfect "flowre of chastity." It was their chastity that enabled both champions to pass the fire.

Now Scudamore was "in love" with Amoret, but his love was imperfect. When he tried to follow Britomart through the flames,

Sable, by the name of *Ewyas*. The fourth and last is *Ermine*, two *Barres Gemewes*, *Gules*, by the name of *Huntercombe*. Insigned with an *Helmet* fitting the degree of a *Knight*, as hath bene formerly shewed, *Manteled gules*, *Doubled Argent*, and for his *Creast* within a *Crowne Or*, a *Beares foote Sable*, *Armed Gules*. And to make his *Atchievement* in all points compleate, he hath annexed this *Motto* or *Device* placed in an *Escrowle* underneath his *Shield*, SCUTO AMORIS DIVINI."

¹⁷ *Mirroure*, pt. 1 (1578), 163.

¹⁸ *FQ*, IV, x, 8, 8-9.

¹⁹ *Mirroure*, pt. 2, 17-17^v.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 19.

he had to withdraw "all scorcht and pitifully brent."²¹ In this respect he is like the other knights who had failed to enter Artidon's cave. In both *The Faerie Queene* and the *Mirroure*, the fire is a love test; success in the test depends on perfect chastity. Scudamore's failure and Britomart's success are easily understood in the light of the *Mirroure* description. In fact, the *Mirroure* explicitly states the same allegorical meaning which Spenser students have long read in the Busirane passage.

III. Rosicleer, passing through a room "well wrought with straunge worke," comes at last to a locked door which is kept by a giant. Above the door is the inscription, "When this doore shall be open, then shall the Queen Artidea be at libertie, and the entrie shall be free unto all people." Rosicleer overcomes the giant and enters the

quadrā, which was mervailous bright and cleere, onely by the vertue of precious stones which were verie bigge, set round about the walls, and in the midst of this quadrā, there was in manner of a stage, verie straunglie wrought, and round about it steps like staires for to go up upon, and upon the same stage there was set in a chaire verie richlie wrought, the Queene Artidea who was verie faire & royallie apparailled, who leaned her head upon her arme, and there was beholding a knight of a verie good countenance and disposition, who was all armed with guilt armour, and brodered with precious stones, kneeling upon his knees before her, having his breast open, shewing unto the Queene his bloudie heart, and although his countenance did shew him to be dead, yet the wound and the bloud was so fresh, as though at the same instant it had bene done. This knight was the wise Artidon, who willingly and with his owne hands did wound and open his breast, after that he hadde brought the Queene thether. . . ."²²

Two brief descriptions repeat the essential aspects of this scene. When the shepherds entered the cave seeking Rosicleer, "they saw the wise Artidon with his breast open in such sort that they might discover his heart."²³ Much later in the story, Claridiana, coming to talk with the magician, "saw the high and rich throne, and thereon the wise Artidon, with his breast all open, shewing forth his heart, which was a verie pitifull and lamentable thing to behold. . . ."²⁴

In *The Faerie Queene*, Britomart, having passed through a door superscribed, "Be bold," also came to an inner chamber "with pure gold . . . all overlayd" (xi, 50-55). Here one door was marked, "Be

²¹ *FQ*, III, xi, 26, 9.

²² *Mirroure*, pt. 2, 22-23^v.

²³ *Ibid.*, 26-26^v.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pt. 3 (1586 ?) 122.

not too bold." Going through this door at the hour of the masque, she enters the mystery chamber and finds it empty

Save that same woefull Ladie, both whose hands
Were bounden fast, that did her ill become,
And her small wast girt round with yron bands,
Unto a brasen pillour, by the which she stands.

And her before the vile Enchaunter sate,
Figuring straunge characters of his art,
With living bloud he those characters wate,
Dreadfully dropping from her dying hart,
Seeming transfixt with a cruele dart.²⁵

Great significance must attach to the *Mirroure* passage because in it an exposed and bloody heart is the core of the enchantment.²⁶ So far as I am aware, this detail has not been found in any analogue in Italian or medieval romance, nor in courtly love²⁷ or masque literature. Not even *Arthur of Little Britaine*, "probably the greatest single influence to be traced in Spenser's poem,"²⁸ gives this detail of the Busirane scene. Mr. Fowler has mentioned some banners of 13th of Henry VIII²⁹ on which were portrayed "rent hartes," etc., and Professor Greenlaw has suggested that the heart symbol here may be somehow related to the Grail mysteries.³⁰ But only here, in the *Mirroure*, is mentioned the specific horror which constituted the major torture at Busirane's castle.

IV

Comparison of these two episodes leads to the conclusions that:

1. Spenser presumably knew and used the *Mirroure of Knight-hood*, parts 1 and 2. The symbolic shield of Scudamore, some of the characterizations of Britomart, and the exposed

²⁵ *FQ*, III, xii, 30, 31, 1-5.

²⁶ There are, to be sure, numerous differences between the Busirane and Artidon passages, but they do not affect the significance of the parallels. We are accustomed to Spenser's constant modification of his sources. So we need not be disturbed, for example, to learn that Artidon is dead. As a matter of fact, this information comes as a surprise to the *Mirroure* reader, for Artidon has behaved, and continues to behave, like a living person. Nor does the fact that Artidon's, rather than Artidea's, heart is exposed make a real difference in Spenser's debt to the *Mirroure*. Artidon, like Amoret, is not perfectly chaste in love and so he it is who suffers.

²⁷ E. B. Fowler, *Spenser and the Courts of Love*, 108-33, condensed in *Variorum*, III, 353-9.

²⁸ E. Greenlaw, "Britomart at the House of Busirane," *SP*, XXVI (1929), 124.

²⁹ *Loc. cit.*, 359.

³⁰ Greenlaw, *op. cit.*

heart of Amoret all have their close counterparts in these early parts of the *Mirroure*.

2. The *Mirroure* must then be added to Spenser's sources for Book III.
3. Therefore, the final date of composition for Book III, cantos xi-xii, is probably not earlier than 1585, the date of publication of part 2 of the *Mirroure*.
4. The fuller study of the *Mirroure*, on which I am now engaged, may very well bring to light more materials used by Spenser in *The Faerie Queene*.

University of Idaho

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF SPENSER'S ANAMNESTES

By BAIN TATE STEWART

Surprisingly, the character of Anamnestes, memory's helper in the Castle of Alma, remains unexplained in the light of psychological theory. After an investigation of the backgrounds of Spenser's theory of memory, Daniel C. Boughner concludes that there is in Elizabethan thought no functionary of the brain which corresponds to Anamnestes.¹ Efforts have been made to explain Anamnestes as an allegorical representation of the contemporary belief in the activity of memory in youth, or as a recognition by Spenser that the aged faculty of memory needs some prompting; it has even been suggested that Anamnestes is a servant type drawn from classical literature;² but these explanations, though possible, hardly seem to offer sufficient justification for introducing a significant unscientific element into what remains essentially an allegory of psychological theory. The fact is that Spenser's conception of memory need not be considered in any sense unscientific or at variance with authoritative psychological doctrine, for Spenser shared with Plato, Aristotle, and Thomas Aquinas the belief in the dual function of the memory.

Spenser mentions Anamnestes briefly in the description of his master, Eumnestes, among his books.

Amidst them all he in a chaire was set,
Tossing and turning them withouten end;
But for he was vnhabable them to fet,
A litle boy did on him still attend,
To reach, when euer he for ought did send;
And oft when things were lost, or laid amis,
The boy them sought, and vnto him did lend.
Therefore he *Anamnestes* cleped is,
And that old man *Eumnestes*, by their proprietis.
(*F.Q.*, II, ix, xlviii)

Upton has suggested the probable derivation of Anamnestes from ἀναμνάω, remind, or ἀναμνησέω recollect;³ but ἀνάμνησις, recollection, is nearer to the Spenserian form. At any rate, the boy Anamnestes undoubtedly combines the functions of recollecting and of remind-

¹ Daniel C. Boughner, "The Psychology of Memory in Spenser's *Faerie Queene*," *PMLA*, XLVII (1932), 95.

² See Boughner, *loc. cit.*, pp. 95-96; Kitchin and Upton, cited in *The Works of Edmund Spenser*, ed. Greenlaw, Osgood, Padelford, *F.Q.*, Book II, Baltimore, 1933, pp. 300-301.

³ Upton, *loc. cit.*, p. 300.

ing, or of aiding recollection by reminding. Significantly, both Plato and Aristotle distinguish as a separate function of the memory exactly this same power of ἀνάμνησις, recollection.⁴ For Plato memory proper consisted in the preservation of consciousness or experience, whereas recollection was the active power by which the soul, when alone, recovered those sensations which it had received through the body.⁵ Aristotle's analysis is even closer to that of Spenser. Memory, according to Aristotle, is a persistent mental impression fixed in the soul and recognized, when recovered, as having been previously held. Recollection, on the other hand, consists in a process of search by which, through a series of suggestions and associations, one moves from a given sensation or concept to a desired impression which is stored in the memory.⁶ And in the psychology of Thomas Aquinas a power known as reminiscence, a sort of preliminary gathering together of particular ideas in preparation for the synthesis of memory, exercises the same general function that is rendered in the accounts of Plato and Aristotle by ἀνάμνησις.⁷ For Plato and Aristotle and Aquinas, as for Spenser, memory, the guardian of the experiences of the past, could recover those experiences only through the agency of a subsidiary power. Clearly the relationship between Eumnestes and Anamnestes in the Castle of Alma is equivalent to an authoritative classical and mediaeval theory of memory and recollection.

I do not insist that Spenser knew Plato or Aristotle or Aquinas directly. He may have drawn upon some unidentified intermediate source. But in view of the precise agreement of idea and the importance of the figures involved, the probability is overwhelming that in creating the character of Anamnestes, Spenser's primary purpose was neither to write popular and unscientific allegory, nor to present a personal judgment upon the activity of the mind; rather he was following a definite psychological theory of memory, which had received exact expression in the works of Plato, Aristotle, and Thomas Aquinas.

Northwestern University

⁴ See William A. Hammond, *Aristotle's Psychology (De Anima and Parva Naturalia)*, London, 1902, p. 195, note 1.

⁵ *Philebus*, 34 b. See also *Phaedrus*, 275. The specific Platonic doctrine of recollection as the source of all knowledge is, of course, another matter.

⁶ "On Memory and Recollection," ch. 2, in *Parva Naturalia*, translated by Hammond, *op. cit.*, pp. 203-205.

⁷ *Summa Theologica*, I, q. 79, art. 4.

MELVILLE'S STRUGGLE WITH THE ANGEL

By LEON HOWARD

The common denominator of most—if not all—critical discussions of Herman Melville is their dependence upon the logical fallacy of “distribution.” Since all successful writers are “artists” within the collective meaning of the word, a conscious artistry in Melville’s work is usually taken for granted. The fallacy in this logical assumption arises, however, when the term “artist” is extended to include notions of craftsmanship drawn from the dispositions of the critics rather than the findings of a comprehensive scholarship. When the concept of art is derived from the cross-word puzzle, critical interpretation sinks into the complete absurdity of presenting Captain Ahab’s artificial leg as evidence of Melville’s belief that “the Will is limited by Fate.”¹ But when a more plausible extension defines the artist as an expert narrative craftsman, the interpretation of his books becomes less obviously unsound: still based upon bad logic, it nevertheless presents both the author and his work in a way that leaves them recognizable though unreal.

For example: The best general discussion of Melville in print insists that “with *Mardi*, *Moby-Dick*, and *Pierre* . . . he deliberately set himself against the main currents of fiction-writing of his time”; it refers to “architectural skill” as a permanent characteristic of his art and admires his lesser works as illustrations of “how thoroughly he had mastered the technique of his craft.”² Yet Melville himself, at the end of his life, made a poetic comparison of his artistic struggle with the wrestling of Jacob in terms that by no means suggest any attainment of professional skill.³ Through a combination of circumstances, on one occasion, he did prevail over “the angel—Art”; but the circumstances seem to have been unusual, and his success was in the mastery of particular materials rather than the

¹ W. S. Gleim, “A Theory of *Moby Dick*,” *New England Quarterly*, II (July, 1929), 411. Cf. the same author’s *The Meaning of Moby Dick* (New York, 1938).

² Willard Thorp, *Herman Melville* (New York 1938), pp. xliv, li, lii. Although Mr. Thorp’s statement serves as an excellent point of departure for the argument in this paper, his treatment of Melville is by far the sanest general discussion in print. His editorial work, also, has been so admirable that most of the minor documents pertinent to a study of Melville’s art may be found—in their best available text—among his selections.

³ “Art,” originally published in *Timoleon* (1891) and reprinted by Thorp, *op. cit.*, p. 365, with interesting notes (pp. 427-428) on MS variations showing Melville’s efforts toward the exact representation of his artistic difficulties.

technique of his craft. My purpose here is to illustrate the limitations of his technical skill by giving a brief survey of (1) the major technical devices he gradually cultivated in his early books, (2) the new artistic influences that produced *Moby-Dick*, and (3) the ineffectiveness of these influences in developing a permanent, dependable craftsmanship.

II

Melville's first five books clearly reveal how he developed, by trial and error, one major literary device which he eventually used with considerable skill. This was the rather elementary device of suspense as it might be achieved by raising melodramatic questions that had to be answered before the book was finished. It appeared first in *Typee*, where the author deviated from an actual record of experiences⁴ by extending the period of his captivity, introducing an idyllic narrative into the simple adventure story, and unifying the two by adding an element of suspense. While the narrator was wandering with Kory-Kory and Fayaway, the chief men of *Typee* were eating another stranger. How would Melville escape a similar fate? The question apparently was more exciting to contemporary readers than it is to us, and it seems to have been deliberately introduced in order to make the idyll something of an adventure and so give a crude unity to the whole.⁵ Yet the device was of no very great importance in *Typee*, and Melville abandoned it entirely in *Omoo* for the rambling, picaresque method. *Mardi* began in the narrative manner of its predecessor; but as the excitement of his rapid intellectual development overwhelmed Melville's desire to tell a story,⁶ he returned to the device of suspense in an effort to sustain narrative interest through a hundred and fifty chapters of social criticism and philosophical speculation which he substituted for the adventure story he had planned. Would the hero find the mysterious blonde? Would he be seduced by the sensuous brunette? Or would he be done to death by three vengeful specters for a crime innocently committed? Melville obviously spent a good deal more time and thought

⁴ See Robert S. Forsythe, "Herman Melville in the Marquesas," *Philological Quarterly*, XV (January, 1936), 1-5; Charles R. Anderson, *Melville in the South Seas* (New York, 1939), pp. 179-195.

⁵ Contemporary advertisements and allusions, as well as Melville's own petulance at his reputation as the "man who lived among the cannibals" (see letter to Hawthorne [1851], Thorp, *op. cit.*, p. 392), bear witness to the effect of South Sea cannibalism upon the imaginations of early readers of *Typee*.

⁶ For evidence concerning the close relationship between *Mardi* and the intellectual stimuli affecting Melville during the period of its composition see Luther S. Mansfield, *Herman Melville: Author and New Yorker, 1844-1851* (unpublished doctoral dissertation; the University of Chicago, 1936).

on the visions of Yillah, the messengers of Hautia, and the spectral pursuers than he had upon the reminders of cannibalism in *Typee*; and, though these devices did not accomplish their artistic purpose, they did establish suspense as a permanent element in his craftsmanship. The anticipation of some malign result from the influence of Jackson was a major constituent in the narrative technique of *Redburn*, and in *White Jacket* Melville revealed conclusively his increasing emphasis upon suspense as a literary device. In his first book he had used suspense for the purpose of binding a certain amount of fiction to the framework of his true narrative. In his fifth, he introduced most of the fiction for the purpose of creating suspense. Almost all of the invention in *White Jacket* is connected with two questions: What would the author do when threatened with a flogging? How would the white jacket almost cost him his life? And the questions themselves are entirely artificial, for Melville is known neither to have been brought to the gratings nor to have worn a white jacket.⁷

The second literary device cultivated by Melville during the early stages of his career was one later revealed in theory by the "Agatha letter" to Hawthorne⁸ and illustrated in practice by his transformation of a chapter from Captain Delano's *Voyages* into the story *Benito Cereno*.⁹ This was the device of allusiveness, or the use of the incident and phraseology for the purpose of giving intellectual significance to the story and of achieving imaginative coherence. In the later books it was used, in part, to support the structural device of suspense; and, by its constant reminders and anticipations of events, it reveals an unusual degree of mental awareness on the part of the author and demands an equal alertness from the reader.¹⁰ Yet Melville was extraordinarily slow in developing it,

⁷ See Anderson, *op. cit.*, pp. 409-418.

⁸ S. E. Morison, "Melville's 'Agatha' Letter to Hawthorne," *New England Quarterly*, II (April, 1929), 296-307.

⁹ H. H. Scudder, "Melville's *Benito Cereno* and Captain Delano's *Voyages*," *PMLA*, XLIII (June, 1928), 502-532.

¹⁰ The importance of this quality of allusiveness can hardly be exaggerated in any discussion of Melville's more ambitious works. The cross currents of allusion in *Moby-Dick*, for instance, reveal a turbulent mental energy which dashes at words and incidents from two or three or even more points of reference. To illustrate: When Melville refers to Ahab occasionally as *king* Ahab the title may allude to the captain's biblical prototype, his characteristic arrogance, his absolute power over the ship and its crew, his occupation of the conventionally royal role of tragic hero—or to all of these at once. Melville's visible cultivation of an increasing allusiveness shows that it was a conscious literary device; but I believe that it was a supporting device rather than a primary one. In the language of the "Agatha" letter, he used it in developing the "significances" with which his material happened to be "instinct," although, of course, he grew more and more inclined to select material that lent itself to such treatment. This opinion is based on two sorts

and his characteristic alertness is missing from his earliest books. In *Typee*, for example, he was capable of referring to "the lofty jet of the whale" as a lethargic influence upon a ship's crew and of attributing the "alleged savagery" of the South Sea Islanders to European influences—completely unaware, it would seem, that he had just traced the lethargy to a persistent failure to sight whales and had just been writing about the traditional barbarity of the natives toward their nearest neighbors.¹¹ In *Mardi*, however, the device of allusiveness was luxuriantly cultivated. To a considerable extent it grew out of the indirection necessary to the presentation of social criticism in the guise of "romance" after the manner of Rabelais and Swift. In part it was the result of Melville's curious fondness for the sentimental flower language of Victorian elegance.¹² But its most skillful cultivation was in the method of characterization newly developed in that book, for in *Mardi*, for the first time, Melville cre-

of evidence that supplement the revelations of the "Agatha" letter: The first of these is my failure to find, in any of Melville's major works, anything more than an occasional, momentary example of the influence of allusiveness upon his narrative invention such as is to be found, for instance, in James Branch Cabell's *Figures of Earth*, the entire plot of which grows out of this literary device. The second is Melville's wasteful use of the device when it can serve no possible purpose, as when he revises the description of the black fish given in one of the sources for the chapter on "cetology" from "the angles of the lips are curved upwards, giving the physiognomy of the animal an innocent, smiling expression" to "the inner angles of his lips are curved upward, he carries an everlasting Mephistophelean grin on his face" (Frederick Dobell Bennett, *Narrative of a Whaling Voyage Round the World from the year 1833 to 1836* [London, 1840], II, 233; *Moby-Dick* ["Standard edition," London, 1922], I, 174). Even Mr. John Freeman, who identifies the whale with Lucifer, and Mr. Raymond Weaver, who identifies it with "demonism at the cankered heart of nature," would have difficulty making this change signify more than mental exuberance; and Miss Viola White, who identifies the whale with "the Old Testament Jehovah," and Mr. Carl Van Doren, who found Ahab representing Lucifer, would have even more trouble.

But this aspect of Melville's art is too complex for full discussion in a footnote, although it needs a considerable amount of attention. It might best be approached formally I believe, through a study of his humor. Informally, an attentive reading of *Mardi* or *Moby-Dick* and either *Figures of Earth* or Elinor Wylie's *The Venetian Glass Nephew* should reveal the great difference between the use of allusiveness as an exuberant supporting device and its use as a primary element in meticulous craftsmanship.

¹¹ *Typee* (London, 1922), p. 10, and chapter iv, in which a discussion of the "hereditary warfare" waged between the Happs and Typees "from time immemorial" is interrupted by a digression attributing "the cruel and bloodthirsty disposition of some of the islanders" to the influence of examples of European aggression. In the next sentence Melville refers to traditional "predatory excursions" of natives "to cut off any imprudent straggler" from the body of his tribe or to "make a descent upon the inmates of some sequestered habitation" (p. 34).

¹² In a forthcoming article on "The Flower Symbolism of *Mardi*" Mr. Merrell R. Davis will supply material for a precise, though hardly profound, interpretation of the "quest" in this novel.

ated a group of fictitious characters who were identifiable by their underlying, individual points of view rather than by any peculiar mannerisms. Although Babbalanja, the philosopher, was a "humor" character, his portrayal required much more thought and subtlety than was needed for the caperings of Doctor Long Ghost in *Omoo*; and this subtlety is revealed in the extraordinary allusiveness of the conversations in which he engaged. Babbalanja can hardly be described as a caricature, but his creator never forgot that a philosopher should speak "most philosophically."¹³ When Melville shackled his exuberance by a return to a basic pattern of autobiography in *Redburn* and *White Jacket*, he sacrificed much of the allusiveness that he had felt free to cultivate in pure fiction; hence, these books, though they have more intellectual depth and imaginative coherence than the first two, seem superficial in comparison with *Mardi*. Melville himself was more critical of them than they deserved.¹⁴ His creative energies had been stimulated by the disguise of fiction; he was impatient with the restraint of actuality; and by the time he began *Moby-Dick* he was anxious to speak again in a role other than his own.

Melodramatic suspense and allusiveness were the two major artistic devices that Melville developed during the early part of his literary career. He may possibly have cultivated one other: the intensification of action by representing the ship as a microcosm.¹⁵

¹³ My guess is that the creation of Babbalanja opened Melville's eyes to the possibilities of dramatic self-expression in the novel. Though the author certainly stood aside from his creation, the philosopher expressed himself freely on many subjects that interested his creator; and the allusive subtlety of Babbalanja's discourse, as his attitudes are changed by the impact of his experiences, seems reasonably good evidence that Melville was identifying himself, dramatically and imaginatively, with his fictitious character.

¹⁴ See his expression of surprise at the favorable reception given his "beggary 'Redburn'" (letter to Duyckinck [December 14, 1849], Thorp, *op. cit.*, p. 376) and compare the tone of his comments on *Mardi*, which, though disparaging, indicate that he considered the book anything but "beggary."

¹⁵ Thorp (*op. cit.*, p. xlviii) believes that Melville began in *Omoo* to explore "the ship-microcosm which [was] to constitute a large element of the formal structure of *White-Jacket* and *Moby-Dick*." It seems to me, however, that Melville's method of composition was just opposite to that implied in this comment. Instead of designing a "ship-microcosm" and selecting his material to fit the plan, he started with material that came to hand and, by stylistic allusiveness and an alertness to all possible "significances" (cf. the "Agatha" letter, *loc. cit.*, and note 10 above), made it as suggestive as possible, thus achieving the effect of a microcosm largely through the accident of his material. In other words, Melville's method of composition seems to have been one of constant leaping and then looking rather than the reverse process of the skilled craftsman. Babbalanja's comments on Lombardo's methods of composition, in the 180th chapter of *Mardi*, suggest as much, and they are so extraordinarily like Melville's own comments on himself (see the letters to Duyckinck and Hawthorne printed by Thorp, pp. 376-377, 383-384, 390, 391,

But there is a more than reasonable doubt whether this was a conscious artistic device or merely an effect incidental to his general alusiveness. His failure to make successful use of it, some years later, in *The Confidence Man* suggests that it was not the well-tested trick of his trade that it might otherwise appear to be. In any case it seems reasonably clear that by 1850 Melville still had a great deal to learn about the craft of fiction and that he did not have at his command a skilled artistry that would enable him deliberately to set himself against the main currents of fiction-writing of his time.

III

As a matter of fact, *Moby-Dick*, more completely than any of Melville's novels, may be described in terms of new influences upon the author's craftsmanship. The technical details of whaling had been carefully reserved for special treatment,¹⁶ and soon after Melville's return from England, in February, 1850, he seems to have gone to work on the book. By August of that year Evert Duyckinck was able to write that his friend had "a new book mostly done—a romantic, fanciful & literal & most enjoyable presentment of the Whale Fishery."¹⁷ What was in this original version we do not know. A literal account of the whaling industry, the fanciful but not unprecedented destruction of the vessel, the romantic element of suspense that anticipated it, and a most enjoyable style—all these

394) that the suggestion becomes important. Furthermore, a comparison of the chronology of the composition of *Mardi* with the chronology of some of the events reflected in it shows that Melville could not have written the book, as it stands, had he not adopted Lombardo's method: i.e., "He did not build himself in with plans; he wrote right on; and so doing got deeper and deeper into himself; and like a resolute traveller, plunging through baffling woods, at last was rewarded for his toils." Melville's account of another imaginary author, in chapter xxv of *Pierre*, is similar; and, in general, he seems to have had little conception of any method of composition that required careful looking before he leaped.

In this connection it should be noticed that the researches of Albert Mordell ("Melville and 'White-Jacket,'" *Saturday Review of Literature*, VII [July 4, 1931], 946) and the supplementary investigation of Anderson (*op. cit.*, pp. 361 ff.) show that Melville probably did not contribute a single invented character to the ship-microcosm in *White-Jacket*.

¹⁶ Cf. the preface to *Omoo*.

¹⁷ Luther S. Mansfield, "Glimpses of Herman Melville's Life in Pittsfield, 1850-1851," *American Literature*, IX (March, 1937), 32 n. In a letter written to Hawthorne, presumably in June, 1851, Melville indicated that though part of the book was "driving through the press" it was still unfinished (Thorp, *op. cit.*, pp. 390, 391). Duyckinck was able to speak of it, in the following August, as completed (Mansfield, *op. cit.*, p. 39); and it was published in London in October, probably being printed from proof sheets for the New York edition of November. Since all the available correspondence recording Melville's labors on the book is from the year following August, 1850, I considered the statement that it was "mostly done" by that time sufficiently arresting to justify a query. Mr. Mansfield, however, assures me that it is accurate.

may have been in the "presentment," for all these Melville had at his command by the middle of 1850. But he had not yet demonstrated any mastery of the tragic characterization, dramatic intensity, and purposeful narration revealed in the finished novel; and it is reasonable to believe that the year of agonized struggle so clearly reflected in his letters represented an effort to achieve these qualities. Also, it seems reasonable to accept as evidence of literary influence his fervid appreciation, during this period, of exactly these qualities as he found them in Shakespeare and Nathaniel Hawthorne.

Actually Melville dated his admiration for Shakespeare from February, 1849, when he heard Fanny Kemble read the part of Lady Macbeth and was inspired to re-read the plays.¹⁸ By 1850, however, he was exhibiting a tendency to despise the "popular," visible evidences of Shakespeare's art and to admire him primarily as a literary artist, especially as revealed in what Melville called the "dark characters of Hamlet, Timon, Lear, and Iago."¹⁹ The tragic dramatist who created Hamlet and Lear apparently appealed most strongly to the man engaged in writing *Moby-Dick*; and his annotation of the plays has recently been presented as further evidence of the close imaginative connection between the tragedies and the novel.²⁰

The dramatic character and the Elizabethan qualities of *Moby-Dick* are well known, and Melville's enthusiasm for Shakespeare during the period of its composition is clearly established. But it has not been pointed out that Melville learned—or thought he learned—from Shakespeare a specific creative method that filled a large vacancy in his artistic bag of tricks. For Melville looked at Shakespeare through the medium of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, and, in doing so, he discovered an artistry that appealed strongly to the author of *Mardi* and that solved some of the problems which had hitherto prevented progress from the creative point reached in that book. Instead of fictitious "humor" characters, Melville was enabled by these influences to create a life-like tragic hero and so to summon up a dramatic intensity he had never before achieved.

Investigations into Melville's reading have not been made with sufficient exactitude to make the evidence complete, but it is known

¹⁸ Letter to Duyckinck, Thorp, *op. cit.*, pp. 370-371. Melville's statement that he had "until a few days ago, never made close acquaintance with the divine William" is more indicative of his new enthusiasm than of anything else, for he had been quoting Shakespeare with some frequency and aptness in his books.

¹⁹ See the comments in "Hawthorne and His Mosses," Thorp, *op. cit.*, pp. 333-334. All further citations of this essay will be by page number to this reprint from the *Literary World*, August 17 and 24, 1850.

²⁰ Charles Olson, "Lear and *Moby-Dick*," *Twice a Year*, I (1938), 165-189. See also R. G. Hughes, "Melville and Shakespeare," *Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, VII (July, 1932), 103-112.

that Melville's closest intellectual associate at the time he discovered Shakespeare was Evert Duyckinck and that Duyckinck was a particular admirer of Coleridge. It may be that when Melville wrote his friend a letter of enthusiastic comment on "the divine William," Duyckinck directed his attention to Coleridge's interpretations of Shakespeare's art in his *Literary Remains*.²¹ In any case, *Moby-Dick* itself indicated that Coleridge's lecture on *Hamlet* came into Melville's mind whenever he stopped to comment on Captain Ahab as an artistic creation. Remembering the dictum that "one of Shakespeare's modes of creating characters is to conceive any one intellectual or moral faculty in *morbid* excess, and then to place himself . . . thus *mutilated* or *diseased*, under given circumstances,"²² Melville prepared for the introduction of his own hero as "a mighty pagent creature, formed for noble tragedies," by explaining that it would not "at all detract from him, dramatically regarded, if either by birth or other circumstances, he have what seems a half-wilful *over-ruling morbidness* at the bottom of his nature." "For all men tragically great," he added, "are made so through a certain *morbidness*"; and he insisted, in the same passage, that "all mortal greatness is but *disease*."²³ Later, in a rather elaborate discussion of Ahab's disease, Melville used an ambiguous phrase that again echoed Coleridge and apparently referred both to the captain's physical and mental disability: "deliriously transferring" his broodings to the white whale, in his "frantic morbidness," Ahab "pitted himself, *all mutilated*, against it."²⁴ Melville's reference to the "royal mantle" over all humanity in defense of his attempt to ascribe "high qualities, though dark," and weave "tragic graces" around "meanest mari-

²¹ Mansfield says that Lamb was "perhaps the supreme literary god of the Duyckinck household" with Browne, Rabelais, Coleridge, and Richter only "slightly less exalted" (*Herman Melville, Author and New Yorker*, p. 180); and he refers to the enthusiasm for Lamb and Coleridge reflected in the *Literary World*, which Melville regularly read (*ibid.*, p. 182). Melville displayed a general familiarity with "Coleridgean" philosophy in his journal for October 12, 1849 (see selections printed in Raymond Weaver, *Herman Melville Mariner and Mystic* [New York, 1921], p. 285) and with Coleridge's poems in *Moby-Dick* and elsewhere; but mention of the *Literary Remains* does not appear in the incomplete record of his readings, and his acquaintance with the volume can be asserted only on the grounds of probability and on the evidence of parallels between the lecture on *Hamlet* and the language of *Moby-Dick*. His reading of *Wilhelm Meister*, which he borrowed from Duyckinck in 1850 (probably just before leaving for Pittsfield, according to Mansfield), may have directed his attention to the psychological criticism of *Hamlet*, although, of course, he could not have found in Goethe the suggestions of creative method discussed below.

²² "Hamlet" in Coleridge's *Complete Works* (New York, 1884), IV, 145. The italics in this and all the quotations given below are my own.

²³ *Moby-Dick*, I, 92.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 229.

ners"²⁵ and his effort, as a "tragic dramatist," to justify his selection of a hero who lacked "all outward majestic trappings"²⁶ is further evidence that he consciously thought of his protagonist as a tragic hero of the sort found in *Hamlet* and *King Lear*.

The Coleridgean version of Shakespeare's creative methods, however, did not solve all the new technical problems overcome during the production of *Moby-Dick*. Melville had never written a book without a "message," and he persistently criticized the Elizabethans for their shortcomings in what he called "the great Art of Telling the Truth."²⁷ He referred to "the muzzle which all men wore on their souls in the Elizabethan day" and declared that even "Shakespeare was not a frank man to the uttermost."²⁸ Melville had to turn to contemporary novelists for the art of frankness and also for methods of more purposeful narration than the drama demanded or he himself had achieved by his own experiments.

There is some evidence—not yet fully explored—that he had read and been affected by Disraeli, Bulwer-Lytton, and Dickens;²⁹ but the narrative methods which Melville adopted as most suitable to his requirements were those of Hawthorne. He had read some of Hawthorne's tales before 1850 and had not been greatly impressed.³⁰ He opened the *Mosses from an Old Manse* in the summer of that year, however, under different circumstances: he had practically exhausted the autobiographical pattern of personal experience, and the problem of narrative invention had become acute. Hawthorne's four-year-old book immediately aroused a profound admiration. Here was an American novelist who "approached" the Elizabethan dramatist. "Not a great deal more," he exclaimed, "and Nathaniel

²⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 144.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 183.

²⁷ See, for example, "Hawthorne and His Mosses," p. 334.

²⁸ Letter to Duyckinck (March 3, 1849), Thorp, *op. cit.*, p. 372.

²⁹ Mr. Norman Pearson has pointed out to me some interesting parallels between Melville's work and Disraeli's; the phrase in Melville's annotation of Shakespeare which so puzzles Olson (*op. cit.*, pp. 175-176) may have been borrowed from Bulwer's *The Last Days of Pompeii*; and Mansfield (*op. cit.*, *passim*) has given evidence of an interest, on Melville's part, in comic illustrators of Dickens and other novelists which seems to me indicative of a possible influence of both the illustrations and their text. Mansfield in calling attention to "Melville's Comic Articles on Zachary Taylor," (*American Literature*, IX [January, 1938], 411-418), has provided, I believe, a concrete example of the influence of caricature upon Melville's methods of characterization, and I suspect that a further study of this subject would show that Melville usually drew his portraits with the bold strokes of the artists in whom he was most interested—or, perhaps more accurately, in the manner of the novelists whom they were illustrating. Cf., in this connection, Thorp, *op. cit.*, p. lxiii, n. 99.

³⁰ At least I think this is the implication of his comments in the letter to Duyckinck (February 12, 1851), Thorp, *op. cit.*, p. 385, when considered in relation to "Hawthorne and His Mosses," pp. 340, 345.

were verily William!"³¹ The stories of Hawthorne, Melville found, possessed their full complement of the mysterious, tragic "blackness" which he so admired as a literary characteristic in Shakespeare³²; and his enthusiasm led him to express a momentary preference for "the still, rich utterance of a great intellect in repose" over the dramatist's "noise and show."³³ Hawthorne also, in Melville's opinion, was the more consistent master "of the great Art of Telling the Truth," for he directly and regularly revealed depths of truth that Shakespeare revealed only "covertly and by snatches."³⁴ The long, appreciative essay which he dashed off before he had even finished reading the book shows all the enthusiasm of a struggling young author who had discovered the man who could teach him his art. "Already," he announced in a sort of postscript to the essay, "I feel that this Hawthorne has dropped germinous seeds into my soul."³⁵ And, cultivated by a quick intimacy, the seeds developed into the narrative technique of *Moby-Dick*—although by the time he finished the book Melville had come to qualify his first admiration by a feeling that Hawthorne might be improved by a little less intellectual repose and more robust vigor.³⁶

This emphasis upon new influences on Melville's craftsmanship does not imply that the author of *Moby-Dick* neglected any of the literary devices cultivated in his earlier books. They are all there. But the distinctive qualities of *Moby-Dick* may be described almost entirely in terms applicable to Hawthorne or actually applied by Coleridge to Shakespeare. The plot is that of the "quest" story, unified by its complete dependence upon the character of the protagonist. It is the sort of plot found in the stories of Hawthorne rather than the casual quest plot found in *Mardi*. The plot is further unified by a parabolic significance which, again, is more like the stories of Hawthorne than anything hitherto achieved by Melville; and, to make the similarity even closer, Melville seems to have been attempting to illustrate the same "profound" and "appalling" moral found in "Earth's Holocaust"—a story which he particularly admired in the *Mosses from an Old Manse*.³⁷ Yet for all the signs of Haw-

³¹ "Hawthorne and His Mosses," pp. 335, 336.

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 333, 343.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 335.

³⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 334 and the implications of pp. 331-333, 341-343.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 341.

³⁶ See the letter to Duyckinck (February 12, 1851), Thorp, *op. cit.*, p. 386. The dedication of *Moby-Dick*, however, displays the continued admiration which is also expressed in the letter.

³⁷ "Hawthorne and His Mosses," p. 332. The moral concerns the "all-engendering heart of man" as the source of "vanities and empty theories"; but this point (and a similar one, below, concerning *Pierre*) will have to be taken on whatever faith still survives in the reader. The all-engendering hearts of the Melville exegeses have surrounded these books with so many vanities and empty theories that an adequate commentary on their "meaning" will require a second—and perhaps even a third—full essay.

thorne's influence, there is none of his intellectual repose in *Moby-Dick*. Ahab is a Shakespearean tragic hero, created according to the Coleridgean formula. He is certainly not Melville, but he is certainly vivified by Melville's sympathetic emotions as though the author fancied himself "thus mutilated or diseased" under the "given circumstances." Furthermore Ahab's disease has many symptoms of that diagnosed by Coleridge: surely he may be described as a man with a "craving after the indefinite," who "looks upon external things as hieroglyphics," and whose mind, with its "everlasting broodings," is "unseated from its healthy relation" and "constantly occupied with the world within, and abstracted from the world without—giving substance to shadows, and throwing a mist over all commonplace actualities."⁸⁸ The difference between Melville's Ahab and Coleridge's Hamlet is not so much in the disease as in the basic character "thus mutilated" and in the "given circumstances" in which he is placed. To put the matter briefly: The literary art which makes *Moby-Dick* different from Melville's earlier works was an art learned from Shakespeare under the tutelage of Coleridge and adjusted to Melville's own peculiar temperament and to the requirements of the novel according to the example set by Hawthorne.

IV

In his painful struggle with "the angel—Art" from August, 1850, to August, 1851, Melville learned more about the technical requirements of a successful novel than he had learned during the preceding five years of his literary career. And there can be no doubt that on this occasion he thought himself blessed with victory. Hawthorne at least understood what he had been trying to do, and as a result Melville felt "a sense of unspeakable security"⁸⁹ that had not come to him after any other book. Inevitably he tried to repeat the achievement.

And with his habitual economy in the use of artistic methods he tried not only a repetition but almost a duplication of the achievement. *Pierre* was merely a younger man, in different circumstances, whom Melville infected with the same disease that governed Ahab. The same descriptive terms that were transferred from Coleridge's Hamlet to the hero of *Moby-Dick* may be used with equal validity in describing *Pierre*. The plot was again—though somewhat less obviously—that of a quest, unified by its dependence upon the character of the protagonist. The same parabolic significance reappears with possibly the same "appalling" moral. The chief differences between the two books grow out of the complete differences in the "given circumstances" in which the characters were placed. Mel-

⁸⁸ See Coleridge, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

⁸⁹ See the letter to Hawthorne (1851), Thorp, *op. cit.*, p. 394.

ville, in *Pierre*, tried to create another novel by the rather simple process of nipping a successful character in the bud rather than by blasting him in full bloom.

Naïve though the plan was, however, it might have been reasonably successful had it not been for a peculiar limitation of Melville's genius and a peculiar requirement of the literary art developed in *Moby-Dick*. One of the restrictions upon Melville's imagination seems to have been that he could not "place himself" in a mutilated, diseased, or any other condition in "given circumstances" that were completely disassociated from his actual experience. Accordingly he placed *Pierre* in circumstances closely related to those of his own boyhood and let his "appalling" fable develop in the commonplace environment of Victorian New York. Hawthorne, with his air of intellectual repose, might have managed such a situation; but an Elizabethan tragic hero in the familiar haunts of the Duyckincks was as out of place as Lucifer among the Buchmanites. For the art of fiction which Melville had cultivated required a more expansive, a more vigorous, and potentially a more dramatic atmosphere in order to be convincing than was supplied by Melville's life in the neighborhood of Albany and New York. Violent rebellion in a polite environment is never an artistic success, and neither was *Pierre*.

The empirical quality of Melville's constructive imagination, together with the exhaustion of his own experiences, forced him to abandon the literary technique developed during his one successful struggle with the art of the novel. He attempted Hawthorne's more restrained manner in a number of short stories, tried dramatic tale-telling without a parable in *Israel Potter*, and made an effort towards a parable without a dramatic hero in *The Confidence Man*—but with no real success in any instance. When he found a story ready to hand that needed only the element of suspense and the development of its incidental "significances," as in *Benito Cereno*, he could accomplish remarkable results. But his later artistic struggles produced no new skill that would enable him to continue his career. Perhaps (to elaborate his own comparison) his one completely successful wrestling bout left him too disabled for any further exercise of his whole energies in a struggle with the art of fiction during the long period between *The Confidence Man* and *Billy Budd*.

At any rate, when at the age of thirty-seven he closed his early career as a writer of fiction, he did so when his artistic craftsmanship was little more than that of an extraordinarily talented amateur—effective only when external influences and personal experiences were united in a fortunate, but largely fortuitous, combination.

Northwestern University

LESSINGS GESPRÄCHE MIT LUDWIG TIMOTHEUS SPITTLER

VON HEINRICH SCHNEIDER

Seitdem Gottschalk Eduard Guhrauer den Brief des jungen Ludwig Timotheus Spittler an J. G. Meusel über seinen mehrwöchigen Besuch im Frühjahr 1777 bei Lessing in Wolfenbüttel¹ in den zweiten Band der Danzel'schen Lessingbiographie aufgenommen hatte,² gehört dieser Bericht in den Lessingbiographien zu den wichtigsten und immer wieder angeführten Quellen über des Dichters glücklichstes Lebensjahr.³ Spittler war durch diesen Aufenthalt einer der Augenzeugen jener Zeit in Lessings Leben geworden, die dieser selbst an ihrem Ende beim Tode seiner Frau in die Worte faßte: "Ich habe es auch einmal so gut haben wollen, wie andere Menschen,—aber es ist mir schlecht bekommen." Im Jahre 1931 hat dann der jetzige Wolfenbütteler Bibliothekar, Wilhelm Herse, das verdienstliche Buch von Flodoard Freiherrn v. Biedermann *Lessings Gespräche* (1924), in dem auch wieder Spittlers Erzählung erschien zum Anlaß genommen, um in einem klugen Versuch den Inhalt der damals zwischen den beiden Männern geführten Gespräche andeutend zu erschließen.⁴ Dabei ging er von der zutreffenden Feststellung aus, daß Lessing auch in der Überlieferung seiner Gespräche, im Gegensatz etwa zu Goethe, vom Schicksal recht stiefmütterlich behandelt worden sei, obwohl er nach allen Zeugnissen ein glänzender Unterhalter gewesen sein muß. Es dürfte deshalb in der Tat bei dem bedauernswerten Zustand der Überlieferung jede Bemühung berechtigt sein, den Inhalt von Unterredungen Lessings zu ermitteln, wenn nur die Tatsache, daß sie, und die Umstände, unter denen sie geführt wurden, bekannt sind.

Über jenen Wolfenbütteler Besuch liegt nun noch ein weiterer Brief Spittlers vor, der bisher den Lessingbiographen und auch Herse offenbar entgangen ist, jedoch aufs glücklichste die längst bekannte Erzählung ergänzt. Der Empfänger dieses Briefes vom 23. April 1777 war Daniel Gotthilf Moldenhawer, den Spittler 1776 auf seiner Studienreise durch Mittel- und Norddeutschland in

¹ Johann Georg Meusel, *Histor. u. literar. Unterhaltungen* (Coburg, 1818), S. 262. Über Spittler (1752-1810) vgl. *Allg. Dt. Biogr.* XXXV, 212.

² Th. W. Danzel u. G. E. Guhrauer, *Gotthold Ephraim Lessing. Sein Leben u. seine Werke*. 2. Aufl. hsg. v. W. v. Maltzahn u. R. Boxberger. Bd. II (Berlin, 1881), S. 564.

³ Vgl. z. B. Waldemar Oehlke, *Lessing u. seine Zeit*. Bd. II (München, 1919), S. 256f.

⁴ Wilhelm Herse, *Zu Lessings Gedächtnis* (Wolfenbüttel-Berlin, 1931), S. 44-49.

Göttingen in einem Kreise gleichalterlicher Theologen und Philologen kennengelernt hatte. Ursprünglich ein Schüler des berühmten klassischen Philologen Christian Gottlob Heyne war Moldenhawer damals Repetent an der theologischen Fakultät in Göttingen, wurde aber schon im folgenden Jahr als Professor nach Kiel berufen.⁵ Er starb 1821 als Oberbibliothekar der Königlichen Bibliothek in Kopenhagen, wo der Brief heute in seinem Nachlaß aufbewahrt wird.⁶ Zu dem genannten Göttinger Freundeskreis Moldenhawers gehörten ferner neben anderen besonders noch zwei Männer: Johann Benjamin Koppe und Johann Karl Volborth. Im Hause Koppes, der 1777 eine Professur erhielt, als eine Berufung Herders nach Göttingen sich zerschlagen hatte, war Spittler mit Moldenhawer bekannt geworden.⁷ Volborth wurde nach Moldenhawers Weggang Repetent, und stand später vor allem in dem Rufe eines Vertreters der lutherischen Orthodoxie im Zeitalter der Aufklärung.⁸ Außerdem war Spittler in freundschaftliche Beziehungen zu dem Kustos an der Universitätsbibliothek und Professor Johann Andreas Dieze getreten, der seinerseits schon seit vielen Jahren Lessing persönlich nahestand und mit gelehrten Ratschlägen unterstützte, namentlich als ein gründlicher Kenner der spanischen Literatur.⁹ Als der junge schwäbische Gelehrte Spittler sich gegen April 1777 auf die Reise von Göttingen nach der Wolfenbütteler Bibliothek begab, stattete Dieze ihn mit einem Empfehlungsbrief an den dortigen Freund und Kollegen aus.

Gleichzeitig mit seinem an Moldenhawer gerichteten Brief, den er am Ende seines Besuches in Wolfenbüttel schrieb, aber erst auf der Weiterreise nach Berlin in Helmstedt zur Post gab, übersandte Spittler dem in Göttingen zurückgebliebenen, damals gerade auf seine endgültige Berufung nach Kiel wartenden Freunde einen kürzeren, von ihm in Wolfenbüttel niedergeschriebenen Aufsatz mit der Bitte, ihn an Volborth zur Veröffentlichung in der *Neuen Phil-*

⁵ Über Moldenhawer (1753-1821) vgl. auch: *Allg. Dt. Biogr.*, XXII, 92 u. vor allem Ada Adler, *D. G. Moldenhawer og hans haandskriftsamling* (København, 1917). Ein Brief M.'s an Lessing v. 18.11.1780 in Lachmann-Munckers Lessing-Ausg., XXI, 309f.

⁶ Der Brief gehört zu *D.G.M.'s correspondenz med Udlændinge* i. 2397, 40. Ich bin der Kongelige Bibliothek in Kopenhagen für Übersendung einer Photokopie zu Dank verpflichtet.

⁷ Über Koppe (1750-1791) vgl. auch: *Allg. Dt. Biogr.*, XVI, 692.—K. folgte 1784 einem Ruf als Hofprediger und Generalsuperintendent nach Gotha.

⁸ Über Volborth (1748-1796) vgl. auch: *Allg. Dt. Biogr.*, XL, 224.

⁹ Dieze (1729-1785) war seit 1763 Kustos an der Göttinger U.B., seit 1773 Professor a.d. Universität u. ging 1784 a.d. Univ. Mainz. Vgl. Karl Bader, *Lexikon deutscher Bibliothekare* (Leipzig, 1925; Beiheft z. *Zentralblatt f. Bibl. Wesen*, 55), S. 42. Die persönl. Freundschaft mit Lessing begann 1766. In einem Br. an Heyne v. 30.10.1773 versprach Lessing ihn und Dieze im Frühjahr 1774 zu einem Besuch der Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel von Göttingen abzuholen (Lachmann-Muncker, XVIII, 92).

ologischen Bibliothek weiterzuleiten.¹⁰ Vorher mußten noch zwei Literaturangaben nachgeprüft werden, was Spittler bei dem Mangel an neueren gedruckten Ausgaben in der Wolfenbütteler Bibliothek nicht möglich gewesen war. Doch lassen wir den Brief selbst sprechen und wort- und buchstabengetreu hier folgen.

Sie wissen, liebenswürdigster Freund, daß ich es immer für einen meiner schädlichsten Fehler gehalten habe, daß ich Ihren lehrreichen Umgang, und Ihre genauere Bekanntschaft nicht früher suchte: und immer werd' ich den Abend segnen, da ich Sie bei Koppen das erstemal genauer kennen gelernt habe, und Koppe mir Nachrichten gab, die auf einmal den Wunsch in mir erregten, aus eigener Erfahrung von dem zeugen zu können, was er mir versicherte.

Unter tausend Segnungen für Sie und für Ihr Wohl verließ ich Göttingen: dann wenn Sie auch weniger freundschaftlich gegen mich gewesen wären, so muß ich mich doch immer bei dem Anblick eines jungen hoffnungsvollen Theologen der innigsten Freude überlassen, dann wer sollte nicht immer so viel Liebe und Patriotismus für sein Fach haben, und wie vielmehr ein Theologe bei so wenig günstigen Aufrichten auf die Zukunft? Schon längstens hätt' ich Ihnen geschrieben, wenn ichs nicht gerade so hätte richten wollen, um g'eich in Ihrer ersten Antwort vielleicht zugleich auch Nachricht von der glücklichen Versicherung Ihrer zukünftigen nähern Bestimmung erhalten zu können. Aber ich laße Ihnen izt doch diese Entschuldigung nicht gelten, wenn Sie die Antwort deßwegen aufschieben wollten. Auf den beigelegten zwei Blättern stehen einige Nachrichten, so Sie etwa Herrn Volborthen zum einrücken in die philol. Bibl. geben. Ich überlaße es aber ganz Ihrem urtheile, ob sie zweckmäßig genug, ob sie interessant genug für die philol. Bibl. sind. Auch soll es von Ihnen abhängen, ob Sie nicht etwa einiges darinn ausstreichen, ändern wollen. Nur Herr Volborth darf keinen Punkt anders machen, als ich ihn gemacht habe. Die untersuchung der Codd. und prüfung mancher andern litterarischen fragen erschwert sich hier dadurch sehr, daß man selten die neueste gedruckte ausgaben in der Bibliothek findet: also sehr oft gar nicht wissen kann, ob man nicht gethane Arbeit thut. Vielleicht ist es mir wirklich mit Cassiodor so gegangen. Ich kannte keine neuere Ausgabe seiner Werke als die Venetianische in zwei Folianten 1729. Auf diese beziehen sich also meine kritische Bemerkungen.¹¹ Hamburger's zuverlässige Nachrichten fanden sich nicht hier, daß ich hätte nachschlagen können, ob eine neuere kritischverbeßerte ausgabe

¹⁰ Die *Neue Philologische Bibliothek* erschien nach Chr. G. Kayser's *Bücher-Lexicon*, Bd. I. bei Weygand in Leipzig u. nur in 4 Bdn., 1776-1778, 8°. Ich bin der Univ.-Bibl. Leipzig für Überlassung einer Photokopie des Aufsatzes aus dem dortigen Exemplar (Sign. App. crit.322) dankbar.

¹¹ Cassiodori. . . *opera omnia* (2 Bde, hsg. v. d. Benediktiner der Mauriner Kongregation Johannes Garetius. Rouen 1679, Neudr. Venedig 1729). Vgl. darüber jetzt die Einleitung zur Ausg. von Cassiodors *Institutiones* v. R.A.B.Mynors (Oxford, 1937), S. 51f.

nach obiger herausgekommen.¹² Dürft' ich Sie nicht gehorsamt bitten, auf der Göttingischen Bibliothek einen Augenblick entweder in Hambergern oder in dem Catalogo der Univ. Bibl. nachzuschlagen. Sollte sich eine neuere, vielleicht verbesserte finden, so machen Sie aus den Beilagen Fidibus.

So muß ich Sie auch bitten, in der Nachricht von Tellern erstlich die Stelle aus seinem Lehrbuch nachzuschlagen,¹³ ob mir mein Gedächtniß vollkommen treu war, und wenn es Ihnen nicht zu viel Mühe macht bei den Worten pag. 4 *ist neuestens* in einer Parenthese Tellers neue Ausgabe von Turretins Hermenevtik pag. . . . zu citiren.¹⁴ Ich erhielt von diesem letztern kritischen Versuch Herrn Tellers die erste Nachricht bei Koppen: hier kann ich aber mit aller Mühe das Buch nicht erhalten, also die Stelle auch nicht genau bemerken, hingegen wird Herr Koppe dieselbe augenblicklich auszeichnen können. Ich mache Ihnen, liebster Freund, tausend Mühe: sollten Sie Sich nicht so viel Zeit abnöthigen können, als hiezu nöthig ist, so werfen Sie lieber die zwei beigelegten Blätter ins Feuer, dann ich möchte in keiner von allen obigen Fragen irren. Und dann noch eine Bitte, doch eine solche deren Erfüllung Ihnen am wenigsten beschwerlich ist. Ich bat in meinem letztern Brief Herrn. Prof. Koppen um Nachricht, ob ich Heynen nicht um einen Brief an Kollarn ersuchen dürfte.¹⁵

Gestern aber bekam ich Brieffe von Stuttgart, wodurch meiner Wiener Reiß ein ganz unvorhergesehenes Hinderniß in den Weg geschoben wird. Mein Vater reißt zu einem baldigen Tode, und seinem Wunsche, mich noch einmal zu sehen, mich wenigstens zu Anfang des Junii bei sich zu haben, muß ich schlechterdings nach den Forderungen meines eignen Herzens folgen. Also hebt sich die Reiß nach Wien wenigstens für dies mahl von selbst auf: und eilen Sie doch Herrn Koppen davon nachricht zu geben, weil er sich sonst vergebliche Mühe um meinethwillen machen könnte.

Ich habe hier viel gefunden, das ich nicht suchte und von allem, was ich suchte, fast nichts gefunden. Unter das gefundene gehört besonders Leßing. Ich näherte mich ihm anfangs mit etwas bangem Herzen: aber die kühnste meiner Hofnungen wurden übertroffen. Ich mag Ihnen davon nicht schreiben, dann ich kann ohne aufwal-

¹² Georg Christoph Hamberger, *Zuverlässige Nachrichten von den vornehmsten Schriftstellern vom Anfange der Welt bis 1500* (4 Theile, Lemgo, 1756-64).

¹³ Zum Verständnis s.u. die Wiedergabe der betr. Stelle des Aufsatzes. Wilhelm Abraham Teller (1734-1804), Aufklärungstheologe, hatte 1764 als Prof. i. Helmstedt ein *Lehrbuch des christl. Glaubens* herausgegeben. Er wurde 1767 Oberkonsistorialrat i. Berlin u. veröffentlichte 1772 ein *Wörterbuch d. Neuen Testaments zur Erklärung d. christl. Lehre*.

¹⁴ Der reformierte Genfer Theologe Jean Alphons Turretin hatte 1728 gegen die pietistische Hermeneutik einen *Tractatus bipartitus de S. sacr. interpretatione methodo* veröffentlicht, den Teller 1776 neu herausgab.

¹⁵ Franz Adam Kollar (1732-1783), bedeutender österreichischer Historiker war seit 1722 Direktor d. Kaiserl. Hof-Bibliothek zu Wien. (*Allg. Dt. Biogr.*, XVI, 472).

lung nicht schreiben. Aber wenn Sie Gelegenheit haben, Hn. Prof. Diezen zu sprechen, so machen Sie ihm doch die verbindlichste Danksagung für den Brief, so er mir an Leßing gab, weil ich von diesem die geschickteste Gelegenheit eines nähern Zutritts nehmen konnte.

Die Vereitlung meiner Wiener Reiß schmerzt mich hauptsächlich deßwegen, weil ich besonders dort einiges sehr wichtiges für Irenaeum zu finden hoffte. Ich habe schon in Göttingen zu *curis criticis* in Irenaeum oder, wenn sich's schiken sollte, zu einer ganz neuen Ausgabe deßelben gesammelt. Grabe und Maßuet haben kaum einen rechten anfang gemacht: ich gerieth auf einige, bisher unbemerkte, Spuren und diese glaubte ich durch Hülffe der Wienerischen Manuskripte verfolgen zu können.¹⁶ Bei der gegenwärtigen Gährung über die Authenticität der Schrifften des Irenaeus, und bei so vielen bisher noch ganz unbenutzten oder falschverstandenen Stellen des Irenaeus—glaubte ich hier reiche Erndte thun zu können. Aber izt ist's dahin! Dann das was ich gesammelt habe, reicht nicht dahin um meinem neuen versuch die höchste kritisch und historische Evidenz zu geben. Und auszischen mag ich mich nicht lassen.

Ich will Ihnen nicht länger vorschwatzen, aber, liebster Moldenhauer! antworten Sie bald, und schreiben Sie mir, wenn Sie nicht zu viel Zeit haben, bloß das interessanteste bloß von Ihnen selbst und Ihren Arbeiten. Sie sollen, sobald ich in Berlin bin, Nachricht haben, damit Ihr Brieff der Adresse nicht verfehle.

Mit der zärtlichsten Hochachtung

Ihr

Aufrichtigster Fr.
Spittler.

So weit schrieb ich in Wolf. da der Brief aber durch schuld der Post liegen blieb, so setze ich Ihnen nur noch hinzu, daß ich wirklich in Helmstädt bin, und daß Sie in m. nächsten Brief eine Beschreibung dieser verblühten Univ. zu befürchten haben werden.

Dieser Brief ist vor allem durch den neuen Beleg für die Anziehungskraft von Lessings Persönlichkeit äußerst wertvoll. Zusammen mit dem Inhalt des begleitenden kleinen Aufsatzes für die *Neue Philologische Bibliothek*, der zugleich den Brief zu erläutern und besser zu verstehen hilft, bietet er dann das weitere Material, um zu den bereits erschlossenen Gesprächen zwischen den beiden Männern andere Themen hinzuzugewinnen. Moldenhauer hatte es keineswegs für nötig gehalten, aus den Briefbeilagen "Fidibus zu machen," sondern sie nach der bibliographischen Ergänzung zur Veröffentlichung weitergegeben. So erschien im 3. Bd. (1777), S.

¹⁶ Die Irenaeus-Ausgabe des Patristikers Johannes Ernst Grabe erschien 1702 in Oxford, die des Mauriners Renatus Massuet 1710 in Paris (Neudr. 1734, Venedig).

142-147 der genannten Zeitschrift ein mit "Sh." gezeichneter Artikel unter den "Kurzen Nachrichten" mit dem Titel "Brief eines reisenden Gelehrten aus Wolfenbüttel—1777," der, wie schon A. Adler feststellte, zweifellos die in Rede stehende Notiz darstellt.¹⁷ Im ersten Teil dieses Aufsatzes beweist der Verfasser die Unzuverlässigkeit der in hohem Ansehen stehenden Cassiodor-Ausgabe des Garetius. Jedoch beschränkt er sich beim Vergleich auf das Werk *variarum epistolarum libri XII*, von dem ihm in der Wolfenbütteler Bibliothek zwei Handschriften vorlagen.¹⁸ Nach dieser Kritik berichtet er über die Bedeutung der Schrift des Theophilus Presbyter, *diversarum artium schedula*, deren vollständige Veröffentlichung Lessing damals vorbereitete, nachdem er schon 1774 unter dem Titel *Vom Alter der Ölmalerey* eine Kostprobe aus diesem von ihm entdeckten Manuskript gegeben hatte.¹⁹ Über die Wichtigkeit dieser Publikation verbreitet sich der Artikel mit den Worten:

Wenn Herr Leßing seinen Theophilus Presbyter herausgibt, so muß die ganze bisherige Geschichte der Künste des mitlern Zeitalters völlig umgebildet werden. Es ist unbegreiflich, daß man weder in Leipzig noch in Paris (denn an beiden Orten sind Codices vom Theophilus) jemals auf den Gedanken gekommen ist, diese wichtige Schrift heraus zu geben. Das Stück von der Ölmalerey, so Leßing bereits hat abdrucken lassen, ist zwar sehr interessant: Aber bey weitem nicht gerade das einzige allein so interessante, sondern noch manche andere Kapitel geben nicht allein die Geschichte der Künste, des Handels, der damals gangbaren Produkte. . . das gröste Licht, sondern oft auch wichtigen Gegenständen der Kirchengeschichte, und besonders der damaligen Verfassung des Mönchswesens, den Verdiensten der Geistlichkeit des achten und neunten Jahrhunderts. . . Als wichtig für Kirchengeschichte bemerkt' ich mir besonders das Kapitel de confectione fistulae (eucharisticae). Ich will Ihnen das Vergnügen nicht rauben, alle die Anmerkungen selbst zu machen, welche mir bey Lesung dieses Kapitels auffielen. So viel aber darf ich Sie im voraus versichern, daß einige nicht unscheinbare Hypothesen, welche man in Ansehung des Gebrauchs dieser Röhrchen bisher gehabt hat, durch dieses Kapitel gänzlich widerlegt werden. Freuen Sie sich mit mir, daß es ein Deutscher ist, durch

¹⁷ Adler a.a.O., S. 36f.

¹⁸ Unter den Wolfenb. Handschriften befinden sich die *Briefe* Cassiodor's in einem *Cod. Augustan.* d. 13. Jahrh. u. in einem *Cod. Gudian.* d. 15. Jahrh. Vgl. Magni Aurelii Cassiodori senatoris. . . *variarum libri XII*. Rec. Theodor Mommsen. Berlin 1894, p. XCIX (M.G.H.Auct.Ant.XII).

¹⁹ Eine kritische Ausgabe der Schrift unter Berücksichtigung sämtlicher Handschriften besorgte Albert Ilg in den *Quellenschriften für Kunstgesch. u. Kunsttechnik d. Mittelalters u. d. Renaissance*, Bd. VII, Wien 1874. Vgl. Anmerkungsbd. d. Lessing-Ausg. v. J. Petersen u. W. v. Olshausen, S. 783ff. —Die Wolfenbütteler Hs. ist die älteste, wenn auch nicht die Original-Hs. u. wird v. Ilg ins 12. Jahrh. angesetzt.

den die Geschichte des mitlern Zeitalters eine solche Aufklärung erhält, und daß es zur Ehre Deutschlands gerade der Mann ist, auf den.. nothwendig aller Augen hätten fallen müßen, wenn man dieser Erfindung unter uns einen Mann zum voraus hätte suchen dürfen. . . .

Zum Schluß des Artikels berührt Spittler dann noch eine besonders wesentliche Frage der damaligen Bibelkritik über den Anfang des Johannes-Evangeliums:

Erinnern Sie sich wol der Leute, welche behaupteten, daß in der Wolfenbüttelschen Bibliothek eine gedruckte lateinische Bibel sey, in der Joh. I. stehe et Dei erat verbum?²⁰ So wenig auch dies einzelne Zeugniß nur zur geringsten Entscheidung dieser, manchen so unangenehmen, Stelle beytragen kan: so war ich doch um so begieriger das Buch zu sehen, weil vielleicht deswegen Herr Teller und vielleicht aus noch andern bisher wenig bemerkten Nachrichten das ganze Stück vom Johannes (neue Ausgabe des Turret. p. 381) izt neuestens hinwegschneidt.

Aber noch nie ist meine Neugier so betrogen worden als diesmal. Das Resultat der zuverlässigst eingezogenen Nachrichten war dieses, daß unter allen lateinischen Bibeln keine einzige et Dei erat verbum lese.

Neben Textfragen der Überlieferung des Cassiodor waren demnach vor allem die kirchengeschichtlichen Ergebnisse des Theophilus-Manuskripts Gegenstand der Unterredungen zwischen Lessing und Spittler. Schon in der Schrift des Abtes Dubos *Von den theatralischen Vorstellungen der Alten*, die Lessing 1755 aus dem Französischen übersetzt hatte, war häufig auf Cassiodors *Briefe* verwiesen worden, und seit dieser Übersetzung war Lessings Interesse an diesem Schriftsteller nicht erloschen. Die Vorbereitung der Veröffentlichung der ganzen Handschrift des Theophilus beanspruchte Lessing viele Jahre. Bekanntlich wurde sie dann erst nach seinem Tode 1781 von seinem Freunde Christian Leiste im 6. *Beitrag zur Geschichte und Litteratur* aus dem Nachlaß, aber ohne jede Einleitung oder Erläuterung, herausgegeben. Weiter aber war es offenbar der Prolog des Johannisevangeliums, mit dem sich Lessings und Spittlers Gespräche beschäftigten, was nicht zu verwundern braucht, da zu dieser Zeit *Das Testament Johannis: Ein Gespräch* gerade vollendet wurde.²¹ Übrigens wissen wir aus anderen Reise-

²⁰ Die der Wolfenbütteler Bibliothek im Jahre 1764 einverleibte Bibelsammlung der Herzogin Elisabeth Sophie Marie, die 1164 Stücke umfaßte, ist besonders reichhaltig an kostbaren und seltenen Drucken. (Vgl. O.v. Heinemann, *Die Herzogl. Bibliothek zu Wolfenbüttel*, Wolfenbüttel 1894, S. 141f.)

²¹ Vgl. den Abdruck bei Lachmann-Muncker, XIII, S. 9ff, bes. S. 14, Z. 36-S. 15, Z. 7.

berichten, daß merkwürdige Bibeldrucke in der berühmten Bibelsammlung der Wolfenbütteler Bibliothek auch sonst oft ein Gesprächsthema der Besucher waren.²² Schließlich zeigt der Schluß des Briefes an Moldenhawer, daß zweifellos Lessings Liebling unter den Kirchenvätern, Irenaeus, dessen er so oft, namentlich in seiner Schrift gegen Goeze *Nötige Antwort auf eine sehr unnötige Frage* und in den *Sogenannten Briefen an verschiedene Gottesgelehrten* Erwähnung tut, gleichfalls in den Unterhaltungen eine wesentliche Rolle spielte. Vielleicht gingen sie auch hier wieder in erster Linie um die Spittler besonders interessierende, unzureichende Textgestaltung, vielleicht aber drehten sie sich um Lessings Überzeugung, daß "Irenaeus die steigende Offenbarung des einigen Gottes überschaute, und, wie den Einzelmenschen vom Bade der Taufe, so das ganze Geschlecht von Adam bis zum Heiland und heiligen Geist fortschreiten sah."²³ Ein Austausch der Meinungen über diese Gedanken würde zur Idee der stufenweisen Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts geführt haben, wie sie Spittler in einem von Herse angeführten Brief an Meusel vom 25. Dezember 1776 zum Ausdruck gebracht, und wie er sie schon im Januar 1777 vor seinem Besuch bei Lessing im "Vierten Beitrag zur Geschichte und Litteratur" in den ersten 53 Paragraphen der *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts* vorgefunden hatte.²⁴ Mit der Wahrscheinlichkeit einer Aussprache über diesen Lessing so wesentlichen Fragenkomplex rundet sich der Kreis, der diese und frühere Beobachtungen umschließt.

Cornell University

²² Vgl. meinen Aufsatz *Von der "Narrenbibel" u. anderen Druckfehlerbibeln*, i. Börsenblatt f.d.dt.Buchhandel (Leipzig, 1930), bes. Anm. 18.

²³ Erich Schmidt, *Lessing*. Bd. II (Berlin, 1892), S. 630.

²⁴ Herse a.a.O., S. 46.

MADAME GEOFFRIN AND MARTIN FOLKES:
SIX NEW LETTERS¹

By HARCOURT BROWN

Madame Geoffrin

One of the wisest and wittiest of the women of the 18th century, Madame Geoffrin is known to us chiefly as the hostess who welcomed the leaders of the philosophic movement to her house and table in the years after the death of Madame de Tencin in 1749. Her own death in 1777 was followed almost at once by the publication of tributes from the pen of the Abbé Morellet and others. We read of her most conveniently and fully in books by the Marquis de Ségur, *Le Royaume de la rue St.-Honoré*,² Tornézy, *Un Bureau d'esprit au 18e siècle*,³ and in English by Janet Aldis,⁴ as well as in a *lundi* of Sainte-Beuve,⁵ an article in the Goncourts' *Portraits intimes du 18e siècle*,⁶ and in a large volume of correspondence published by C. Mouy,⁷ containing her letters to and from the king of Poland, Stanislas Auguste Poniatowski.⁸

The elaborate apparatus provided with some of the items just referred to may not be taken as an indication that the biography of Madame Geoffrin is now complete. Although we have some of her letters to Hume, to Marmontel, to Falconet, to the Abbé Paciaudi, as well as to Stanislas, a few to Montesquieu and Voltaire, nothing

¹ These letters are published by permission of the Council and Officers of the Royal Society of London, to whom I wish to express my thanks. My attention was called to them in 1932 by Mr. H. W. Robinson, the learned librarian of that body, whose courtesies have enabled me to bring many of the problems these texts offer to at least tentative solution. Further work was done in 1934-35 when I was in Europe on a Traveling Fellowship of the American Council of Learned Societies. Unfortunately it has not been possible to check the proof sheets of this publication against the MSS; the archives of the Royal Society were consigned to a safe place in the summer of 1939, where they are to remain for several years.

² Paris, 1894.

³ Paris, 1895.

⁴ *Mme Geoffrin, her salon and her times, 1750-1777*, London, Methuen, 1905.

⁵ *Causeries de lundi*, Paris, Garnier, II, 241-258.

⁶ Paris, 1857-58.

⁷ *Correspondance inédite du Roi Stanislas-Auguste Poniatowski et de Mme Geoffrin, 1764-1777*, Paris, 1875.

⁸ Further details concerning Madame Geoffrin's visit to Poland, her correspondence, and her Polish friends, may be found in Martin, Marietta: *Une Française à Varsovie en 1766, Mme Geoffrin chez le Roi de Pologne, Stanislas-Auguste*, Centre d'Etudes Polonaises, Année 1935. *Séances et Travaux*, Paris, Librairie Polonaise, 1935, pp. 71-159.

in any of these refers specifically to her youth, the years in which she waited with such patience as she could muster for the heritage of Madame de Tencin, her neighbor in the rue St.-Honoré and the chief obstacle in her path to supremacy in the salons of Paris. In most of the documents already published we find her as a person whose place is assured, whose circle of friends and acquaintances is complete and stable, and whose ambitions for intellectual prestige are largely satisfied. Half a dozen anecdotes about her husband and her friends barely suffice to write the biography of a woman of fifty; and yet if she had died in the middle of the century, we apparently would know her not at all, although she had already been an active force in building the cosmopolitanism which contributed so much to the influence of the Encyclopedist party.

Thus a rather special interest attaches to any documents which come down to us from this milieu as it was in the years before the death of Madame de Tencin. Madame Geoffrin is sufficiently important in the movement of ideas and the evolution of taste to justify the publication of any documents that may enlarge our knowledge of her circle and its rôle in the elaboration of the work of the encyclopedists.

The ffolkes Papers in the Royal Society

The letters reproduced herewith came to the library of the Royal Society of London in 1932 in the three volumes of miscellaneous correspondence addressed to Martin ffolkes between 1738 and 1743.⁹ Before they appeared for sale at Sotheby's on June 27, 1932, they had been preserved in the family, apparently remaining unused by scholars until analyzed for the Historical Manuscripts Commission.¹⁰ At that time a résumé of the contents concerning France and French history and literature was published in the *Journal des Savants*.¹¹ Soon thereafter copies of the Montesquieu letters were

⁹ Among the two or three hundred letters preserved in this group of manuscripts, we note seven by Réaumur, four by Dortous de Mairan, two by Montesquieu, three by Jean Baptiste Secondat, two by Maupertuis, and two by Buffon. Of these, only the letters from Montesquieu have been published. Unfortunately a number of letters were extracted from these volumes at the time of sale, including two by Voltaire and others by Buffon and Montesquieu. One signed letter by Mme. Geoffrin was purchased by Mr. W. W. Manning of London, who in turn transferred it to a dealer in Paris. Its present location is unknown.

¹⁰ Historical Manuscripts Commission, Appendix to third Report, 1872, p. 247: "The Manuscripts of Sir William Hovell Browne ffolkes, Bart., at Hillington Hall, co. Norfolk." A description of the correspondence of Martin ffolkes is found on page 248, where there is a reference to "many letters by Mme Geoffrin about Polybius."

¹¹ *Journal des Savants*, 1878, p. 383: an abstract of the Reports of the Royal Commission on historical Manuscripts, London, 1870-76, 6 vols., signed F. de S. (probably F. de Schickler). The detail is limited to a brief mention of the letters by French authors, including "plusieurs de Madame Geoffrin sur Polybe." The reference is of course to the long disquisition on polyps in the second letter.

made for Laboulaye, then engaged in the preparation of the *Œuvres Complètes de Montesquieu*.¹² So far as I am aware, there are no other publications based on these documents which bring out their importance for French studies.

Martin ffolkes

Before discussing the contents and character of the letters themselves, it may be desirable to describe briefly the man to whom they were addressed. Martin ffolkes (1690-1754)¹³ was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1714; deriving his large income from the capital amassed in his father's legal practice, he devoted his time and energies largely to antiquarian studies and philosophical speculations. The candid Stukely said that he had "a great deal of learning, philosophy, astronomy," but that he "knew nothing of natural history."¹⁴ He casts doubt also on his religious beliefs, asserting that ffolkes is "in matters of religion an errant infidel and loud scoffer; professes himself a godfather to all monkeys, believes nothing of a future state, of the Scriptures, of revelation. He perverted the Duke of Montagu, Richmond, Lord Pembroke, and very many more of the nobility who had an opinion of his understanding; and this has done an infinite prejudice to religion in general. . . . He thinks there is no difference between us and animals, but what is owing to the different structure of our brain, as between man and man. . . . He has been propagating the infidel System with great assiduity, and made it even fashionable in the Royal Society. . . ."¹⁵

As a result of a quarrel with Sir Hans Sloan over the presidency of the Royal Society, ffolkes left England for Rome in 1733, taking with him, says Stukely, "his wife and daughter, dog, cat, parrot, and monkey."¹⁶ He returned to England about 1735; in his *Eloge*, Grandjean de Fouchy is perfectly explicit in his statement that ffolkes did not visit France before 1739:

¹² Paris, 1875-79, 7 vols. Comparison of the published text of the Montesquieu letters with the remaining originals suggests that the printed text is based on a transcript furnished by a correspondent, presumably English. Thus the first in the series (Laboulaye, VII, 252; Gêbelin et Morize: *Correspondance de Montesquieu*, II, 395) has been dated by the latest editors "ce 14 février, 1744," while the original manuscript reads 1741. Less important variations in the text would suggest that the French editors had to work with a faulty transcription, rather than with the original manuscripts.

¹³ The name Folkes or ffolkes has been spelled variously at different times. The family spelling is now with the double "ff" minuscule; but in the Royal Society the name has usually been given a capital "F"; our subject seems to have favored this spelling, although he used a written form that permitted both interpretations.

¹⁴ *Publications of the Surtees Society*, Vol. 73: "The Family Memoirs of the Rev. William Stukely, M.D." (London, 1880), I, 98.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

[Il] résolut en 1733 de faire le voyage d'Italie. . . . Il prit sa route par l'Allemagne, arriva à Venise, d'où il poursuivit son voyage à Rome et à Florence; et ayant reçu partout les marques de la plus haute estime, il s'embarqua à Livourne, et revint par mer en Angleterre, ayant employé deux ans et demi à son voyage.¹⁷

Dans le voyage qu'avait fait M. Folkes en 1733 il n'avait point vu la France; il résolut de réparer cette espèce d'omission, et y passa au mois de Mai 1739 . . . un séjour de plusieurs mois, pendant lesquels nous eûmes presque toujours le plaisir de le voir assister à nos assemblées.¹⁸

Thereafter he appears to have remained continuously in England, at least until after the close of the period which at present interests us.

In 1741 he was elected President of the Royal Society; in 1742 he was chosen by the Académie des Sciences to replace the astronomer Edmond Halley as one of the foreign members of the French body. Thus he had good reason for preserving his scientific correspondence from these years, and we can but regret that this habit appears not to have been continued, the volumes acquired by the Royal Society containing no letters of later than the last days of 1743.

ffolkes remained as President of the Royal Society until 1752, when continued ill-health caused him to give up many of his interests. Neither family archives nor the collections of the Royal Society offer much information concerning the latter years of his presidency; however, the abundance of material from the years 1742 and 1743 suggests that the international exchanges may have continued, although perhaps hindered by the intensive military campaigns of 1745-47.

The ffolkes-Geoffrin Correspondence

I have dwelt on the character and position of the recipient, because they are to a large extent responsible for the type of news and information sent to ffolkes from his various correspondents, including Mme. Geoffrin. These letters must be read as discussing chiefly, perhaps only, the things that she knew would interest ffolkes. Maupertuis is mentioned with some regularity, for about 1728 he had been in England, where his subsequent work was watched with interest, as of one who was propagating and elaborating the Newtonian physics. His election to the Académie française is reported in a letter of July 17, 1743; the discussion stimulated by his *discours de*

¹⁷ Grandjean de Fouchy: *Eloges des Académiciens de l'Académie Royale des Sciences morts depuis l'an 1744*. [Tome Premier] Paris, 1761, p. 327.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 330.

reception,¹⁹ with its striking comparison drawn between the functions of the literary man and those of the scientist, is well reflected in Madame Geoffrin's mordant comments on contemporary taste. In the remaining thirty years of her life, Madame Geoffrin had much occasion to study the *genus poeticum*, not only in public, but in her home.

The letters show clearly something of the spirit in which Madame Geoffrin faced the contemporary men of letters. She seems to have had small sympathy with the absurd vanities of some of the writers of her time; her shrewd intelligence respected only real worth, wherever it might be found. For the work of men of science she shows a naïve admiration rather than comprehension; her excursions into natural philosophy are those of a completely ignorant woman who tries for the sake of a friend to give an account of some new discovery. These remarks are suggested by her effort to describe the newly discovered fresh-water polyps, then being studied by a number of French scientists, Abraham Trembley at the Hague, Réaumur in his home in Poitou, and others in Paris and elsewhere. Martin ffolkes had already heard of the curious forms of life which multiply by simple division; the starfish, and other types were already under observation, and very soon the first books which offered engravings and detailed descriptions were to appear. Meanwhile, accurate and authentic information was at a premium and ffolkes turned to Madame Geoffrin to see if she had heard anything new on the subject: her answer, in the letter of January 12, 1743, is a notable example of her fundamental humility which may be recommended to all who are asked about matters beyond their powers.

From the rest of her letter, it appears that the little "worms"—she uses the French word *vers* to describe them—whose separated parts grew into complete wholes were intensely interesting to the salons of Paris; more so among the less scientific part of the reading public than among the members of the Academy of Sciences whose preoccupation was mathematics or physics. Fortunately Mme. Geoffrin was able to visit Réaumur in his summer home in Poitou, and there she was able to see the polyps themselves, as collected by the scientist and ready for observation. Her letter adds nothing to science, but it does give us a glimpse of the nature and size of the public that scientific writers could reach in 1743.

This brief and inadequate sketch must not be concluded without reference to two further passages which illustrate her tolerant worldly-wisdom. Among the closest of her friends in these years seem to have been Montesquieu and his son Secondat; the marriage

¹⁹ *Œuvres de M. de Maupertuis*, Lyon, 1756, III, 259-270.

of the latter according to arrangements made by his father was a subject of deep and arduous reflection for Madame Geoffrin, which results in a long digression in the letter of January 16. Perhaps one may be pardoned for seeing in this passage the usual explosion of the 18th century at the evidences of human *sottise*: in any case, her letters of May 17 and July 17 offer a lively description of the milieu in which the humanitarian spirit of the philosophic circles had to work.

While these letters do not offer us a complete picture of Madame Geoffrin's relations with England, they suggest that there may have been as vigorous an exchange of ideas, sentiments and opinions between France and England in the 1740's as we know there was in the decades following 1750 and the rise of the fame of Diderot and J.-J. Rousseau. The Montesquieu correspondence, fragmentary as it is, the continued presence of French writers and savants in London (as shown by the elections to the Royal Society), and the continuous translation of English authors in these years—La Place's versions of the dramatists, Prévost's of Richardson, Desfontaines' of Swift and Fielding—all suggest that the *anglomanie* of the twenties and early thirties was running deeper and broader as the century progressed. Lack of documents has meant to a considerable extent that impressions and deductions have had to replace accurate information concerning the exchanges between France and England; while the papers of Martin ffolkes will help notably with the years 1742-1743, let us hope that the discovery of other similar documents will enable us to complete our picture not of these years only, but of the whole decade.

The Question of Dates

Although the date of none of these letters is completely given, it has been possible to establish their sequence with some assurance of accuracy by means of their content as well as by their place in the ffolkes papers. The three volumes containing French letters were not put together with scrupulous accuracy; letters in volume I are dated consecutively between mid-July and December of 1743; in Vol. II, after four or five dated from 1739, 1742, etc., the letters follow in order from May 1743 to mid-July of that year; and in Volume III the dates run from January 1743 to April, with a few of 1741 and 1742 scattered in the middle of the volume, and at the end a group of letters by Réaumur, Maupertuis, and others, of December of 1742. With this scheme of dating apparent in the volumes as a whole it has seemed that Madame Geoffrin's letters fall easily into the sequence as presented here, and reference to public events mentioned in the letters, the death of the Abbé de St. Pierre, Mon-

tesquieu's law suit, etc., has tended to verify our conclusions. In any case, these are, so far, the earliest letters by Mme. Geoffrin to find their way into print.

The Question of Spelling

Comprehension of these letters is notably assisted by reading aloud; this practice causes the peculiarities of spelling to disappear.

It is difficult to set any logical stopping place between reproduction of the original text as closely as modern typography permits and a thoroughgoing revision into modern French, with accents, punctuation, capital letters and paragraphs all established irrespective of the author's idiosyncrasies. Even the most fundamental and useful part of such revision, the regularization of punctuation, involves deciding a number of questions of interpretation, which calls, unfortunately, for more assurance than we possess concerning Mme. Geoffrin's intentions. To take a single instance, her use of the comma is dictated almost entirely by ear. In perhaps a dozen cases she closes a paragraph with a period, or a mark that looks more like a period than her usual comma; but she seems to have no idea of the use of anything else, whether dash, semicolon, or question mark. It seemed on the whole that there might be a sufficient number of persons interested in the record of how her speech sounded to her for us to leave it as she wrote it.

The reader may find the following list of peculiarities of some help:

1. Double letters are often reduced: *honeur*.
2. *n'* often prefixed without meaning to verbs with initial vowel after *on*, *en*, etc.: *on n'avoit*, *on n'est*, *j'en n'ai*, etc.
3. "h" is often prefixed to a word beginning with a vowel, particularly after mute "e"; *grande hunion*, *homme hunique*, etc.
4. Apostrophes occasionally unnecessarily used: *d'ont*, *m'est* (for *met*), *l'ouanges*, *laqu'elle*, *qu'and*.
5. *à* is often prefixed to word following: *apresent*, *aplaindre*, etc.
6. The following are representative misspellings: *aussous*: *au-dessous*; *aûte*: *ôte*; *aytois*: *étois*; *boneur*: *bonheur*; *ce*: *se*; *cera*: *sera*; *envoyéz*: *envoyé*, *envoyai*, etc.; *indisse sartin*: *indice certain*; *m'est*: *mets*, *met*; *moiennén quois*: *moyennant quoy* (*de cette façon*, or *voilà pourquoi*); *palons*: *parlons*; *saïsser*: *cesser*; *u*: *eu*, *eus*, *eût*; *vus*: *veux*.

I

December 15, [1742].

MS Folkes III, No. 93.

Addressed: A Monsieur / Monsieur Folkes / président de la Société / roiale des Sciences / A Londres. //

London postmark: DE in a circle.
13

Seal: red wax, two oval shields or cartouches; on the left one a griffin over a displayed eagle, on the right two fesses wavy. The whole device is surmounted by a coronet with nine pearls.

Ce 15 decembre¹

Mr le president de montesquieu, et Mr de maupertuis me firent hier l'honneur de soupé chez moy,

Et pour vous dire Monsieur la joye que j'u de voir dans les mains du président une lettre² de vous, il faut vous dire l'inquiétude ou j'ay été de puis quinze jours sur votre santé,

a mon retour de la campagne un homme de l'academie des siences me dit qu'on n'avoit dit a leur assemblee que vous étie fort mal, il me dit le nom de celuy qui avoit dit cela, j'envoyez chez lui, il dit que c'étoit une telle personne qui luy avoit dit, j'y envoyez aussie, il dit qu'il le tenoit d'un aûtre, enfin j'ay envoyé chez plus de dix personnes sans avoir pus trouver la source de cette mauvaie nouvelle, en fin j'ay écrit a londres pour scavoir ce qui en étoit, et j'en n'atandois la réponse avec beaucoup d'impassience, mais cette lettre que j'ay vue hier au soir m'aûte toute inquiétude, et me voila avec l'espérance que vous ête an bonne santé ce que je souaite je vous assure de tout mon coeur.

cest par proget monsieur que je n'ay pas répondu sur le champs a votre dernier lettre, mais comme je vous en n'avois écrite plusieurs consecutive, j'ay voulu vous donner le tems de vous délasser³ de moy,

Mr. le comte d'aneskiold⁴ est partie pour continuer ces voiajes, il est venue me dire adieu, et nous parlames bien de vous, mais comme cétoit dans le tems que j'aytois inquiette de votre santé ce fut avec douleur, je vous assure monsieur que j'en n'ay eu une bien véritable,

¹ This letter may safely be dated as of the end of 1742; it occurs with other letters of December of that year at the end of Volume III of the ffolkes correspondence. In November of 1743 Montesquieu was to leave Paris to winter in Bordeaux and at La Brède; cf. Letter VI.

² In the Montesquieu correspondence as published there are two letters from ffolkes to Montesquieu and several from Montesquieu to ffolkes; from their contents, it does not appear that Mme. Geoffrin refers to any now extant.

³ *reposer de* obliterated and replaced with the present reading.

⁴ Count Frederick Danneskjold-Samsøe, 1703-1770, natural grandson of Christian V of Denmark, was a student of mathematics, shipbuilding, and navigation; he was well known abroad. At this time he was first secretary of the Danish navy.

quois que je sois tranquilisée par la lettre d'hier une de vous m'est nécessaire, et je vous pris de ne me la pas faire attendre.

je vous fais un milion de remersimens du présen que vous voulé bien me faire des déssins de ce peuvre Mr. Norden,⁵ je vous assure que je les recevrai avec plaisir et reconnoissance, j'enverrai chez Mr Guerin libraire,⁶ pour les demander,

je crois monsieur que vous n'aves point oublié Mr de Secondat⁷ fils de Mr de Montesquieu, je vous dirai sous le seau de secret que son pere luy rendoit la vie fort amere et qu'il a couronné ces duretés en le mariant malgres luy, cest un garson remplie de vertu, de mèrite, et de sagesse, et avec un gout si décidé pour les siences, que tout ce quil désiroit au monde etoit de pouvoir les cultiver, et son pere luy en n'a toujours refusée tous les moiens, il desiroit avec passion d'aller faire un voiage en angleterre avent de céder a la fureur que son pere avoit de le marier, il n'a jamais pu obtenir cette grace, enfin il est marié de puis pres de deu(x)⁸ ans, et il n'est point encore acoutumé a ce jouc, il ma souvent demandé de vos nouvelles, je me suis venté a luy du plaisir, et de l'honneur que j'avois dans scavoir par vous même, il m'an n'a fait son compliment et m'a prié de vous faire les siens et de le renouveler dans votre souvenir, il m'a même dit qu'il vous avoit écrit, mais que sa lettre avoit été perdue parce quil n'avoit pas songé a en payer le port de bordeaux jusqu'a paris, ce qui est nécessaire qu'an on écrit des provinces d'ans le païs etranger, en fin monsieur il a pour vous tous les sentiments que vous mérité ne parlé point de luy a son pere qu'an vous luy écrirai, il n'a jamais aimé que ces amis fussent ceux de sons fils, il hignore que je soix en comerce avec luy, leur caractair est si diférend quil est tout simples qu'il ni est pas entre eux une grande hunion, ils ons tous les deux beaucoup desprit, de mèrite, et sont tres aimables, et tres sur, dans la societe, cest une grande fatalite, que de si bonnes

⁵ Frederick-Ludwig Norden, 1708-42, was a Danish naval officer, and traveled in Holland, Italy, France and England; he was elected F.R.S. in 1741. Norden was one of the first to make an accurate study of the ancient monuments in Egypt, which he visited in the winter of 1737-38. The present text probably refers to the thin volume, *Drawings of some Ruins and Colossal Statues at Thebes in Egypt, with an account of the same in a letter to the Royal Society*, dedicated "to Martin Folkes, Esq., President, and to the Rest of the Council and Fellows of the Royal Society of London for Improving Natural Knowledge." The letter of dedication is dated from "London, 7th of January, 1741"; the volume contains 4 plates, two of them printed in green, engraved by Tuschler, one anonymous in black, and a plan in green by Vertue.

⁶ This transaction may also be referred to in Letter VII reproduced below.

⁷ Jean-Baptiste, baron de Secondat, 1716-1796. According to Jules Delpit, *Le Fils de Montesquieu* (Bordeaux, 1888), he married Marie Catherine Thérèse de Mons on August 30, 1740. The Folkes MSS contain three letters by him. The material in this letter touches on an aspect of Montesquieu's character not discussed by his biographers.

⁸ Paper torn.

choses ne sufissent pas pour faire l'hunion des coeurs, les hommes on bien des diférente façons d'être malheureux, et bien peut de moyens pour être heureux, l'amitié qui en ceroit un si doux, est la chose du monde la plus rare, et cette rareté auguemente monsieur le cas infinie que je fais de la vôtre

je vous pris d'ajouter a mon adresse rue St honoré

II

January 16, [1743].

MS Folkes III, No. 13.

Addressed: Londres / a Monsieur / Monsieur folkes président / de la Societé royale des / sciences / a Londres. //

London postmark: IA in circle.

13

Seal missing.

ce 16 janvier

quois que je sçusse, par toutes les informations que j'avois faite que vous étiez en parfaite santé, je vous assur Monsieur que la confirmation que vous m'an n'avez donné vous même m'a fait un tres grand plaisir, sur tout étant acompagné des choses du monde les plus flatteuse pour mon amour propre, et pour mon coeur, iun et laûtre trouve bien son compte avec vous, personne ne peut jamais sentire mieu que moy le prix de vos louanges, et de vôtre amitie, j'espere que je mériterai toujours l'une et l'aûtre.

puisque vous m'assuré monsieur que l'interrest que je prend a vôtre santé vas vous la rendre chere, je vous répète encore que je m'i intéresse beaucoup, pour vous engager non seulement a la conserver, mais même a prevenir le mal, par quelques remedes de précautions tel que la saigné, et les purgations, cela est toujours nécessaire a quelqu'un qui est aussi gras que vous l'ête, et cest cette graisse qui avoit de beaucoup augeumenté la peure que j'avois que le bruit qui avoit courut ne fut vray,

j'ay mandé a Mr de Secondat tout ce que vous m'avéz dit sur son compte de tendre, et d'obligent, je n'ay pas encore eu sa réponse, mais je suis bien sur de sa sensibilité, et de sa reconnoissance, il est a bordeaux de puis plus de trois ans, il est conseiller au parlement¹ cette aucupation auguemente encore, l'ennuie, et le malheur de son état, en fesant une diversion considerable a son goût pour létude des sciences, en ne luy laissant pas le tems nécessaire pour si livrer,

¹ According to Delpit, in November of 1736 Montesquieu had bought a *charge de conseiller* for his son.

j'ay reçu monsieur les trois exemplaire des dessins que vous m'avez envoié² dont je vous fais mil remercements, je suis tres fâché de ce que vous me mandé que vous regardé comme perdue tout le reste de l'ouvrage, cela est yréparable et je ne comprend pas que lon n'ayez pas prit toutes les précautions pour la sureté d'un ouvrage aussi pressieu

Mr de Montesquieu m'a amené un abbé italien nommé Mr cécati³ cest un homme desprit, et de mérite, mais le plus grand qu'il ayez pour moy monsieur, cest celui de vous conoitre, de vous aimer, et de vous admirer, j'ay eu le plaisir de parler de vous tout a mon aise avec luy, il a envie d'aller en angleterre, et je lay bien encouragé a faire ce voiage, que je vouderois bien moi même pouvoir faire, vous ne me parlé point de revenir en ce païs, vous m'aviés cependant donné des espérances la dessus, quand j'eu l'honneur de vous voir ici, et cest sur cette espérance que je me suis livré tout d'abor a l'affection que je me sentie pour vous, et si vous me trompé je suis en droit de me plaindre, mais je vus croire et esperer, que vous remplirai quelques jours vos engagements.

Vous me demandé monsiur quelques éclaircissements sur les vers que lon coupe par morsaux⁴ et a quis ils revient la partie que l'on leur a coupé, je vous répéterai ce que je crois vous avoir déjà dit, que je suis fort ignorante et qu'avec toute l'envie du monde de saisser de l'être, mes aucupations domestiques ne me donne pas le tems de m'instruire, je resterai donc toute ma vie dans mon ignorance, mais comme je vis avec des beaux esprit, et des sçavans, a force de les entendre parler, jentand quelques mots de leur langue, et puis comme j'ay prit mon partie de me donner pour ce que suis, je ne m'est aucun ménagement aux questions que je leur fais, ni au propos que je leur tien, et sans sçavoir ce que je dit je vas toujours

² Cf. Letter I, note 5. That the rest of Norden's drawings were not lost is shown by the publication in London, 1757, of two large volumes under the title *Travels in Egypt and Nubia* by Frederick Lewis Norden, F.R.S., Captain of the Danish Navy. Many of the plates in this volume were engraved by Karl Marcus Tuscher at ffolkes' expense. A letter in the present collection dated August 17, 1743, from Danneskjold-Samsøe mentions a price of £58 for this work.

³ Gasparo Cerati, 1690-1769, was a Parmesan noble, Provveditore Generale of the University of Pisa, F.R.S., and affiliated with divers other academics of the continent. In a letter of January 6, 1743, to ffolkes, Cerati writes: "Aiant l'honneur ici de frequenter la maison de Mad^e Geoffrin, nous nous sommes felicitez mutuellement de la connoissance que nous avons de votre illustre Personne, et nous nous sommes trouvés reunis dans la juste idee de votre merite. Mr le President de Montesquieu aussi vous honore infiniment, et m'a chargé de vous faire ses tres humbles complimens." (Folkes MS III, 3.)

⁴ For an account of the discovery of the fresh-water polyps, cf. J. Torlais: *Réaumur*. Paris, Desclée de Brouwer, 1936, pp. 157-174. The Folkes MSS contain many letters from Trembley, Bonnet, Réaumur, and others, discussing these minute organisms.

mon train, je vais en user de même avec vous monsieur et répondre a la question que vous me faite, tout comme si jetois bien au fait de la chose, et en vérité je n'an scait pas un mot, et vous le verai bien, par tout le vébiage que je vais vous faire,

on n'a commencé a parlé de cela ici, il y a pres de deux ans, ce fut un nommé Mr bonet⁵ de geneve quie prétendit an n'avoir fait la découverte, mais on dit qu'elle a été faite par un Mr tremblet⁶ d'holande, cela a fort aucupé paris pendant un tems, et surtout les hignorans plus que les scavants car Mr de réaumur⁷ pretant qu'il scavoit cela il y a long tems.

cela n'a pas fait un grand èfet parmis les academissiens dont la phisique est le genre,

on disoit que cètoit des vers assé gros, pour que l'on put distinguer tres aisement l'opération soprenante que la nature operoit en eux, que lon leur coupoit la tête qu'au sitot il revenoit une tête, que sy on les coupoit par la moitie il revenoit un quèu a une des partie, et une tete a laùtre, que si on les coupoit en long toute la moitie du corps revenoit,

je parlé de cela a Mr de Maupertuis qui ne me parut fort entousiasmé de cette découverte, il me dit qu'il regardoit ces vers comme une espesse mitoiennne entre les plantes, et les animaux.

j'ay été chez Mr de réaumur cette été, il me montra de quois, il étoit question, je vis dans un cobelet de verre, de leau, et de la terre mêlé ensemble, avec un grand èguille, il sépara cette terre et me fit voir quelques chose qui etoit de la longeur d'une épingle et de la grosseur dun fil a coudre, et qui avoit bien peut de mouvement, je ne pus distinguer la tête d'avec la quèu, les deux extremité me parurent finir en pointe et que cette pointe étoit un peut vérdates, Mr de réaumur me fit compliment, sur la bonté de mes yeux d'avoir pue apersevoir cette nuance il me dit quil étoit tres vray quand les coupant en plusiur morsaux non seulement il ne saissoit pas de vivre mais que ces extremités que j'avois vu revenoit a chaque partie, mais que ce nétoit qu'au bout d'un sertin tems comme par exemple quinze jours ou trois semaine, soit quil ne me jugeas pas digne d'ans entandre d'avantage soit qu'il n'ut pas le tems, il ne me

⁵ Charles Bonnet, 1720-1793, Swiss philosopher and naturalist.

⁶ Abraham Trembley, 1700-1784, Swiss naturalist, tutor in the Bentinck (English) family at the Hague, travelled in Germany and Italy as tutor of Charles Lennox, third Duke of Richmond, Lennox, and Aubigny, 1735-1806. Trembley was encouraged by Réaumur and Bonnet to publish a work on the animal nature of polyps, *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire d'un genre de polypes d'Eau Douce, à Bras en forme de Cornes*, Leiden, Verbeck, 4 vols., reprinted at Paris, Durand, 1744, 2 vols.

⁷ René Antoine Ferchault de Réaumur, 1683-1757, geometrician, physicist, naturalist, inventor of the thermometer that bears his name, member of the Académie des Sciences, 1708, and author of *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des insectes*, Paris, Imprimerie Royale, 1734-1742, 12 tomes in 6 vols., 267 plates.

dit que cela, mais dans un dernier voulume⁸ quil vient de donner, et dont on m'a dit même qu'il vous avoit envoié un exemplaire, il y a une peface ou il parle de ces vers fort en détail, insie monsiur par ce livre vous sçauré tout ce que lon peut sçavoir sur cette matier, et tout mon vébiage vous cera bien inutil, mais comme cela ma procuré le plaisir de causer plus longtems avec vous, je n'ay point de regret a mon bavardage et d'autant mieu que vôtre bonté, et vôtre amitie m'assure de vôtre indulgence,

J'ay un amy a londres que je vouderois bien quil fut conue de vous, cest le chevalier Schaub.⁹ je luy ay beaucoup parlé de vous, il m'a dit qu'il chercheroit l'aucasion de faire conoissance avec vous, et j'espere qu'il la trouvera, il est doux d'avoir des amis commun, cela lié, et fortifie l'amitie, on n'a le plaisir de parler de lun, avec l'aûtre et puisque cela multiplie le plaisir de parler des personnes que l'on n'aime, cela l'auguement, hé mon dieu tout ce que nous avons d'agréable en cette vie est si court, qu'an vérité il faut l'alonger tant que lon peut mais jay bien peur que ma lettre ne le soit trop,

cependant il faut encore que je vous parle des reflections que vous faite sur le mariage, je les ay trouvé bien sentie, et bien rendue ouy le mariage ceroit létat de tous les états le plus heureux si lunion des coeurs, en fesoit le seul liens, mais quand il ni a que ceux que les loix nous donne ils sont bien térable, si un mariage heureux donne une idée du paradis, un mauvais mariage est une peinture bien vivante de lenfere, pourquoi faut til que les hommes qui paroissent fait pour la Societé ayent si peut les qualites qui y sont absolument nécessaire, pourquoi faut til que les hommes, qui paroissent désirer si ardament d'être heureux face sans saisse tout ce qu'il faut pour ne l'être pas, la liberté est le plus grand de tous les biens, il ni a rien quilz n'ayent y imaginé pour ce l'aûter, les loix quilz on faite, les passions a quois ils ce livrent, les chimers apres quois ils cour, et dont ils sçaucepe sans saisse sont non seulement des liens, mes des chaines tres pesante dont ils ce garote, en fin l'inconséquence des hommes, est de tout les phénomennes, et de tout les prodiges de la nature le plus surprenant, a mes yeux, les hommes comun, et sans esprit ne donne pas lieu a faire toute ces reflections

⁸ Réaumur: *Mémoires*, Vol. VI, contains a peface "dont la seconde partie apprend ce qui a été nouvellement decouvert, tant par rapport aux Insectes qu'on multiplie en les coupant par morceaux, que par rapport a diverses productions prises jusq'ici par les Botanistes pour des plantes, quoiqu'elles soient des ouvrages d'Insectes, et leurs domiciles."

⁹ Sir Luke Schaub, born at Basle, Switzerland, d. 1758, was in diplomatic service in Vienna, Copenhagen, and Paris. He was British ambassador in Paris, 1721-1724. Mme. Geoffrin's efforts to bring together her two friends were successful; Schaub writes to folkes from Stowe, September 20, 1743, "Je regrette bien, Monsieur, le tems que nous avons été sans nous voir et sans nous entretenir de notre incomparable amie." And again, "Je ne croyois pas mériter qu'elle songeât à moi." (Folkes MS I, 44.)

aussitot qu'on n'a vue qu'ils nont point desprit, on n'a tout vue, et lon croit voir la cause de tout ce quil font de dérasonable,

Mais quand on voit des gens de beaucoup desprit, agire encore plus ridicullement que ne font ceux qui n'an n'ont point, dire, et écrire, la moral la plus pure, donner des maximes les plus juste, et faire des actions qui ne le sont point, on ne sçait plus ou on en n'est,

quand je lisoit aûtre fois un bon livre, tout ce que je désiroit, étoit de conoitre l'aûteur, contant quil devoit beaucoup mieu valoir que son livre, et que tout ce qu'il me diroit, ceroit bien plus éxelent que ce qu'il avoit écrit, ho que l'experience m'a bien désabusé, j'ay vue de ces aûteurs, jen nay presque pas trouvéz qui ne fut considerablement aussou de son livre quand un homme fait un livre il y m'est tout ce quil a pensée, tout ce qu'il a aprit, et tout ce quil a entendue dire, surement il na rien gardée je me figure voire un homme qui pour bien vider[sa] poche la retoure, il ne luy reste donc [rien] vous ête même tout étonné de ne pas trouver [en]¹⁰ luy les principes des choses qu'il a ditte, ces que ces choses nêtois pas de luy, les hommes en général ne sont que des écos, ils ne font que ce repêter, tout ces beaux esprit que je vois, me font faire toutes ces réflexions, il ni an na pas un qui soit heureux, pas un qui ne fut insupportable a vivre, pas un qui remplisse les devoirs de son état, pas un qui conoisse ceux de l'amitie, en fin pas un qui soit philosophe, mais je ne le suis guere de vouloire le paroître plus que les autres,

je fini donc monsieur an implorant de novous vôtre indulgence pour ce pompeux galimatias et en vous assurent que je vous suis, et vous cerai toujours tendrement ataché

j'embrasse mademoiselle votre fille et la remerisie de l'honneur de son souvenir, la mienne¹¹ vous fait bien des compliments

¹⁰ Paper torn: words in brackets supplied.

¹¹ For Mme. Geoffrin's daughter, Marie Thérèse, Marquise de la Ferté-Imbault, 1715-1791, cf. Constantin Photiades: *La Reine des Lanturelus*, Paris, Plon, 1928.

III

March 15, [1743].

MS Folkes III, No. 39.

Address: A Monsieur / Monsieur Folkes président / de la Société royale des Sciences / A Londres //.

London Postmark: MR in circle.14

Seal as in Letter I.

ce 15 mars

il y a environ quinze jours, que je vous ay adressé une lettre de mr de Secondat, je ne voulue pas l'accompagner d'une des miennes de peur de vous devenir insupportable, j'ay toujour cette crainte monsieur quand je vous écrit, mais elle est bien tot dissipée par vos lettres qui son si polie, si affectueuse, que non seulement je me sens rassuré, mais même encouragé a vous répéter souvent combien je me sçais bon gre des sentiments que j'ay pour vous, combien je me trouve honorée de ceux que vous avés pour moy, et combien en fin il est doux d'être en comerce avec un homme de vôtre mérite, d'ont lesprit, n'est point audépend du coeur, je vous assure monsieur et je crois vous l'avoir déjà dit, mais je vous le répéterai encore bien des fois, que je fais plus de cas, sil est possible, de vôtre bonté, et de vôtre sensibilité que de la beauté de vôtre esprit, et de l'étendue de vos lumiers, et de vos conoissance,

je ne peut pas vous dire combien je suis ravie que mon cher chevalier Schaub, soit aprésen apporté de vous aimer, et de vous estimer, autant que je le fais, je suis bien sur quil vous rendra toute la justice qui vous est due, il ce conois bien en mérite et en homme,

Vous avéz mi toute les graces possible a la façon dont vous avez fait conoissance avec luy, jéspere que vous n'auré point de regret aux avances que vous luy avéz faite quand vous le conoiterai d'aven-tage.

Non, je ne peux pas vous dire quel satisfaction cest pour moy, de vous sçavoir tout les deux amy, je vais vous dire comme dans l'évangile quand vous cerai assemblé en mon nom, je cerai au milieu de vous,¹ il est bien sur que jy suis de coeur, et desprit, je suis bien aise de n'avoir sçu vôtre indisposition que quand elle a été passé, mais comme la fieuvre est un indisse sartin dun fond d'humeurs je vouderois que vous prissie des eaux, cest un remede qui n'est remede qu'autant qu'il oblige a un régime qui est le plus grand de tout les remedes, en fin monsieur faite ce qui faut pour vous bien porter, et pour revenir en ce pais ci, je suis bien aise que vous ne m'autiés

¹ Cf. the letter Mme. Geoffrin wrote to Montesquieu, October 22, 1751, à propos of the visit paid the latter by Viscount Cornbury, Lord Hyde: "Parlez de moi quelquefois ensemble, quand vous serez assemblés en mon nom, je serai au milieu de vous."

pas l'esperence que jen n'ay, les louanges que vous me donné deveroit naturellement bien m'humilier, en rentren en moimême, et en sentant combien je les mérite peut, mais jay prit une aùtre partie, qui m'est beaucoup plus agréable, et je me suis dit, puis que monsieur folkes, a de lamitie pour moy il faut que je vaille quelques chose, je reçois donc avec reconnoissance l'aplaudissement que vous donnè a ce que je pence, et a ce que je dit, et je suis fort aise que vous soiez asse content de moy pour ne pas regrêter le tems que vous emploiez amécirre, je vous assure monsieur que vos lettres me font veritablement du plaisir et ~~puis~~ que je crois tout ce que vous me dite d'obligent, ayez la même contenance en la sincérité, de mes sentimens, et de mes parolles,

Mr de Mairan² a été reçu a l'académie francoise il y a huit jour, son discours a eu beaucoup de succes, il est vray quil le mérite, cest un des meilleurs que j'aye vue, et j'en n'ay été bien aise, car j'aime, et estime mr de mairan il a une douceur dans les moeurs qui le rend fort aimable dans la Société, et beaucoup de prudence qui en fait la Sureté,

mr G. Cerati est encore a paris il y a quelques tems qu'il n'est venue chez moy parce qu'il a été malade, sa santé est délicate, et son imagination aussie, elle influe beaucoup sur les personnes, qui on des indispositions sens avoir de maladie, il est comme cela, et même il a tres bon visage, ce qui fait douter que les infirmités dont il se plaint, soit³ aussi réelle qu'il les crois, en tous les cas il est aplaindre jene sçait même si on ne l'est pas d'avantage, de ce croire malade, que de l'être véritablement, l'imagination est plus difcil a guérir que les maladies.

je ne fais aucune façon de vous prier de faire mil amitie pour moy a nôtre chevalier⁴ car je ne doute pas qu'il ne soit bientot le vôtre, comme il est le mien,

je ne luy écrit pas aprésen parceque je le crois aucupé triste-ment des affaires de vôtre païs, qui deviennent les nôtres par linfluence quelles y ont, il est amy des seigneurs qui sont a la tête des partis auposée, et avec les sentiments que je luy conois pour ces amis, il est bien douloureux pour luy de voir cette division, Si il y avoit un moien de consilier les esprits personne ne ceroit plus capable que luy de le trouver, et de l'employer, indépendamment, de

² Jean-Jacques Dortous de Mairan, 1678-1771, physicist and mathematician, was received into the Académie des Sciences in 1718. He was secretary to that body 1740-1743, in succession to Fontenelle, member of the Académie Française, F.R.S., and member of various continental academies. Author of the *Eloges des académiciens de l'Académie des sciences, morts de 1741 a 1743* (Paris, 1747), which includes accounts of the cardinals de Polignac and de Fleury, Halley, Brémont, Bignon, and others.

³ Read *soient*.

⁴ Schaub.

l'entendue et de la justesse de son esprit, sur toutes les choses de la vie, il a encore des connoissance particulier sur la politiques, personne ne l'entend mieu que luy et ne la fait mieux entendre aux aûtres moy qui suis de lignorence la plus profonde sur cette matier, quand le chevalier m'en parloit, il me fesoit voir tout cela si claire que je me croiois dans ce momens la capable de gouverner l'europe, adieu monsieur je vous embrasse de tout mon coeur, je vous pris d'embrasser pour moy M^{lle} votre fille, la mienne vous fais bien des compliments.

IV

May 17, [1743].

MS Folkes III, No. 83.

Address, postmark, and seal missing.

ce 17 may

mr de céрати ce détermine enfin a aller a londres avent de retourner en son païs,¹ j'en vie bien je vous assur monsieur le plaisir qu'il aura de vous voire, je le charge de la part de Mr de mairan de vous remètre un exemplaire des mémoires de l'academie de 1740.² j'ay obligé mr de Mairan d'y joindre léloge de mr hallay³ dont j'ay été si contante que j'ay voulue que vous le fussie aussi, quois que cene soit pas l'uzage de les montrer avent qu'ils soit imprimé, je luy ay bien promie que vous le veriez vous seul, je me suis fait vôtre caussion aupres de luy, je sçait monsieur qu'on peut lètre de vous sans aucun risque pour tout ce qui a raport aux vertues morales et civiles, insie en répondans de vôtre discretion, je cour moins de risque que si je répondois de la mienne, ce n'est pas ce pendant que je n'ayez une bonne étourderie a vous reprocher.

la dernier fois que vous avés écrit a mr de mairan, et a moy, vous vous ête mépris pour les adresse vous avés mi la mienne sur celle de mr de mairan, et la sienne sur la mienne, quand je vis la méprise j'en fremie, car comme il auroit pu m'ariver de vous parler de tous ces messieurs les Sçavants, et beaux esprits sans contrainte, et que vous auriéz pu me répondre en conséquence, cela auroit fait

¹ In a letter to folkes dated May 22, 1743, Cerati states that he intends to make the trip to England, probably in the company of the Marquis of Locmaria. (Folkes MS II, 11.) In a note of the same date, Montesquieu likewise writes of Cerati's intended departure. (*Ibid.*, II, 10.)

² *Histoire de l'Académie Royale des Sciences, Année 1740*, Paris. Imprimerie Royale, 1742.

³ In a letter to Folkes of the same day (May 17) Mairan says, with reference to the *Eloges*: "Mme Geoffrin, à qui je l'ai lu, me persuade enfin de le joindre à ce paquet." (Folkes MS II, 26.) And again on September 1 of the same year, he writes: "Mme. Geoffrin m'a confirmé en même temps le jugement favorable que vous avez porté de mon éloge de Mr Halley, et dont je suis flatté autant que je le dois, par le cas infini que je fais de votre discernement, et de votre savoir." (*Ibid.*, I, 41.)

un beau tapage, heureusement les deux lettres pouvoit ce voir par des tiers sans inconvenient mais quois quil ne soit arivéz aucun mal de ce quiproquo, j'ay résolue cependant de vous en faire une bonne réprimande, comme la voila faite, je vous demande pardon de la liberté que j'ay prise de vous gronder, nous avons un proverbe, qui dit, qui aime bien, bien chatie, vous sçavéz monsieur l'amitié que j'ay pour vous, je vien de vous endonner une nouvelle preuve par cette remontrance, celle que vous me donné monsieur de vos sentiments pour moy sont bien plus douce, je ne puis vous exprimer combien je suis touché de tout ce que vous me dite d'obligen et de fateur, et de la façon dont vous me le dite, et cest cette façon qui me persuade de la vérité de votre amitié pour moy, il me semble que le langage du sentiment a un caractaire qui luy est propre et ou on ne peut point ce méprendre, et j'ose vous assurer que comme je parle tres bien cette langue, je l'entend fort bien aussi,

j'ay été bien touché de l'inquiétude que vous a donné la santé de mademoiselle votre fille, je desir qu'elle soit parfaitement rétablie, et qu'elle vous donne toute la saticefaction que vous mérité,

mon dieu que je vous crois un bon pere on ce doit trouver bien heureux de vous appartenir.

mon chevalier⁴ m'a écrit avec transport sur le boneur qu'il avoit de vous conoitre. Sa lettre n'est remplie que de l'ouanges de vous et de remersiments pour moy, j'ay fait la une bonne besogne, en vous rendant amis l'un de l'aûtre, dont je me lourai toute ma vie, et dont je tirerai le doux avantage de pouvoir toujours parler, a l'un de l'autre, ce qui fait un nourriture nécessaire, et agréable a l'amitié,

Mon dieu que j'approuve bien votre façon de penser sur la guerre, de toutes les folies des hommes, cet la plus folle, et de toutes les sages opinions de vos quakers, le gout quils ont pour la paix est la plus sage, je me suis toujours sentie beaucoup de penchan pour eux, et quois que je ne les conoisse que par les lettres philosophiques de voltaire, j'ay une tres bonne hidée de leur secte, la tranquillité fait le fondement de leur boneur, et je suis persuadé qu'il n'i a que celuy-la.

Nous venons de perdre un de nos philosophe pour qui j'avois la plus tendre estime, et d'ont j'avois la plus haute opinion, cest l'abbé de St pierre,⁵ personne ne la conue mieu que moy, je me

⁴ Schaub.

⁵ Charles-Irénée Castel, abbé de Saint-Pierre, 1658-1743, scientist, theologian, and moralist, had frequented the homes of Mme. de Lafayette and the Marquise de Lambert and the circle of Malebranche, Nicole, Vertot, etc. Member of the Académie Française 1695, author of the *Projet de paix perpétuelle*, Utrecht, 1713-1717, 3 vols. His *Discours sur la polysynodie*, 1718, attacking the government of Louis XIV and proposing a constitutional plan for France, caused him to be excluded from the sessions of the Academy. He was active 1724-1731 in the *Club de l'Entre-Sol*, a radical and libertine society finally suppressed by Cardinal Fleury, who considered it subversive. Saint-Pierre spent his last years writing and publishing under private patronage.

plaisois a le faire parler, et a conoitre sa parfaite et sublime philosophie, enfin j'en tirois un si grand partie, et il le sentois si bien, qu'il me dit un jour, qu'il étoit un instrument et que j'en joüois bien.⁶ C'étoit un homme hunique, et je me trouve d'autant plus heureuse d'avoir vécu de son tems, que je ne crois pas possible qu'il en puisse naitre un pareil de plusieurs siecles. Cest maupertuis⁷ qui le remplacera a l'academie françoise,

mr de mairan⁸ quitera le secrétaria de celle des sciences a la fin de cette année tout le monde en est fâché cest un homme de mérite, et qui convenoit tres bien a cette employe, mais luy ne trouve pas que cette aucupation luy convienne il veut avoir la liberté de son esprit, et de son tems, et n'être pas a sugetie a fair une chose plus tot que l'autre.

Mr de m'aurepas⁹ a fait tout ce qu'il a pue pour l'empêcher de quitter, mais sa résolution est prise,

cette place poura regarder m'aupertuis, cest un homme sçavant, et de beaucoup d'esprit et qui en n'est bien digne,

je ne doute pas monsieur que vous ne fassie m'antion de moy avec mr de cerati je cerai en bonne main, il m'a témoigne toutes sortes de bontés, et je suis bien sur des vôtres dont je vous demande la continuation en vous embrassant de tout mon coeur,

adieu monsieur, conservé votre santé, et vené nous voir, dumoins donné m'on l'esperence.

⁶ This reference justifies the attribution to Mme. Geoffrin of the famous anecdote cited by D'Alembert in his *Eloge de Saint-Pierre*, (*Œuvres de D'Alembert*, Paris, Belin, 1821, III, 254): "Une femme de beaucoup d'esprit ayant eu avec lui un long entretien sur des matières sérieuses, en sortit si contente, qu'elle ne peut s'empêcher de lui marquer tout le plaisir qu'elle venait d'avoir. 'Je suis,' répondit le modeste philosophe, 'un mauvais instrument dont vous avez bien joué.'"

⁷ Pierre-Louis Moreau de Maupertuis, 1698-1759, geometrician, member of the Académie des Sciences 1723, had visited England in 1728 and was well known to leading figures there.

⁸ Mairan writes to ffolkes, September 1, 1743: "Il n'y a rien de nouveau à vous mander de l'Académie sinon que je quitte le Secretariat à la fin des trois années où je m'étais engagé d'en exercer les fonctions et qui expirent avec cette année-ci. J'ai représenté à cette occasion qu'il était à propos de désigner et nommer d'avance celui qui doit me succéder. En conséquence de quoi, hier 31^e aout, l'Académie proceda a l'élection et toutes les voix furent pour M. Grand-Jean de Fouchy dont vous trouverez les qualitez sur la liste qui est à la fin du livre ci-joint. C'est un jeune homme d'esprit et de savoir, de moeurs douces et sociables, et que j'espere qui remplira fort bien cette place. Pour moi tout honoré que je me sentois de l'occuper, j'y renonce volontiers pour l'emploi libre de mon loisir, qui est ce que j'ai de plus cher dans la vie. Me voilà aussi bientot délivré de ces éloges qui ont plu sur ma tête, pendant le temps de mon exercice. . . . Combien . . . notre Société Royale est elle louable. . . . de s'être affranchie pour toujours de cette parlerie publique!" (Folkes MS I, 41.)

⁹ Jean-Frédéric Phélypeaux de Maurepas, 1701-1781, minister to Louis XV and Louis XVI. In a letter to Richelieu, July 20, 1744, Mme. de Tencin writes: "La Geoffrin a de l'esprit; elle méprise Maurepas et voudroit lui tordre le cou." (Pierre-Maurice Masson: *Mme de Tencin*, Paris, Hachette, 1910, p. 199.)

V

July 17, [1743].

MS Folkes II, No. 70.

Addressed: A Monsieur, Monsieur Folkes president de la Societé royale des Sciences, a Londres, Angleterre.

London postmark; IY in circle.13

Seal: Two interlaced script G's on an oval shield or cartouche; coronet with nine pearls.

ce 17 juillet

je vais commencer monsieur par m'acquitter d'une commission d'ont je suis chargé par Mr de Mairan, cest de vous dire, quil a reçu la lettre par laquelle vous luy faite des remersiments, des memoires de l'academie, et ou vous luy demande si il est necessaire que vous en fassie a l'academie même.

Il a dit a l'academie de vôtre part tout ce qu'il y avoit a dire, le plus ceroit inutile, et de la sienne monsieur il vous fait mil compliments et remersiments, de toutes les honêtetés que vous luy dite, et de toutes les bontés que vous luy temoignée, jay donné a Mr de Maupertuis l'article qui étoit pour luy dans la dernière lettre que vous mavez fait l'honneur de mecrire il vous remersie de vôtre attention,

il a été reçu a l'academie françoise. son discours n'a point reussit quois qu'il y eu bien de lesprit il a trop parlé de géometrie dans une assemblée qui n'est consacrée qu'au belle lettres et aux choses d'agrémens,¹ on ne sçait ou on n'an n'est, ni ce qu'on veut pour ces discours. si il y a un peut de sublime on dit qu'on ne les entand pas, et si il sont simple on les trouve plat, et commun, je trouve que nôtre goût ce gête tout les jours, les aûteurs veullent mètre trop d'esprit dans leur ouvrages et tous les lecteurs croient en n'avoir plus que les aûteurs, moiennent quois il ni a plus de clarté dans les ouvrages, ni déquitté dans les jugements que l'on nan porte, un bel esprit de profession est honteux de dire simplement une chose simple, plus ce qu'il a a dire est commun, et plus il veut le tourner, le contourner, et l'entortiller pour le rendre sublime, celui qui écoute cette frase, ou la lit, ne l'entand pas, mais il n'en veut pas convenir, et il y donne un sens qui n'est point celui qu'elle a, moyannant quois nos livres novos, et les conversations ne sont plus que de pompeux galimatias réellement je vois et entand cela tout les jours et cela me degoute tout les jours de plus en plus des beaux esprits je ne me trouve a mon aise que quand je rencontre un homme simple et de bon sens qui dit ce qu'il sent et ce qu'il pense tout uniment, mais voila assé disserté sur le bel esprit.

¹ Maupertuis was received into the Académie Française June 27, 1743. His *discours* has been published in the *Œuvres de Maupertuis*, Lyon, Jean-Marie Bruyset, 1756, Tome III, p. 259.

Palons sentiment, et sur tout du mien, jen veus vous dire monsieur combien il a été reveillé pour vous par une galanterie charmante qu'un homme de mes amis m'a fait en voici l'histoire, il a quelque tems que je reçu une lettre de vous comme cette homme étoit avec moy, je luy demandé permission de la lire, il vit par les mouvemts de mon visage qu'elle me fesoit plaisir, il en badina avec moy et me demanda de qui elle étoit, je luy dit vôtre nom, et combien je vous aimois, et estimois et apres luy avoir dit les bonnes raisons que j'ens n'avois nous parlames d'aütre chose, quelques jours apres je fu a la campagne, et a mon rétour je trouvé sur ma cheminé un petit paquet qui estoit pesent je demandé ques qui l'avoit aporté, mes gens me dirent qu'ils ne le sçavoient pas cela augementa mon empressement avoir ce quil contenoit, et il fut bien saticefait quan j'y trouvé vôtre medaille, si ressemblante que je fis un grand crie, en disant, ha cest monsieur fokes,² a ma surprise a succédé la joye, en verité jen n'ay beaucoup d'avoir vôtre portrait, et je sçait bien bon gret a mon amy, de m'avoir procuré ce plaisir, jay decouvert que c'étoit celuy qui avoit été témoing du plaisir que me fesoit la lécure de vôtre lettre, qui m'avoit fait cette galanterie, j'ay fait part de ma bonne fortune a tous mes amis, et de mairan vouderois bien en n'avoir autant, il me ceroit fort facil de le saticefaire en priant la personne qui m'a donné vôtre medaille de m'en fair encore venir une, mais il veut la tenir de vous, insie monsieur il ne faut pas que vous soiez rigoureux a son desir, saticefait le, a la premiere aucasion que vous trouverai.

il faut que mon amitié pour vous soit a toute epreuve, puis que j'e n'i ay pas sentie la plus petite alteration, depuis nôtre bataille³ perdue contre vos compatriotes, ils nous ont en verité fait bien du mal, je ne puis pas vous exprimer la consternation ou a été tout Paris depuis trois semaines, il ni a presque pas de maison ou on n'est a regréter un parent ou un amy, enfin nous avons perdue 3000 mil hommes, et nous n'avons pas gagné un pouce de terrain, mon dieu que la guerre est un vilaine chose est til possible que les hommes qui ce perfectione tous les jours dans les beaux arts, et les talents, et les conoissance, ne perfectionneront jamais leur raison, et ne regarderont pas la guerre comme la plus grande folie qui puisse antrer dans leur tête, quand jentand parler de l'ensienne barbarie dune façon a sen croire a mil lieux, je trouve que l'on n'est dans une grand hereure, on n'a changé quelques chose dans la forme, mais le fond est toujours le même, tant que les hommes ce detruirons par la guerre, il faut qu'ils ce compte aussi barbare que l'on été les peuples les moins policée, cette malheureuse affaire a répendu une

² Thus in MS.

³ The battle of Dettingen took place on June 27, 1743.

tristesse si général qu'il n'a pas été possible de ce garentir d'en n'être affecté chacun en particulier j'en n'ay été absorbé, et puis j'aytois si fâché d'entendre dire du mal de vôtre nassions que j'aime a cause de vous, et de mon cher chevalier, que je ne sçavois ou me fourer pour ne pas entendre les m'auvais propos qui sont d'autant plus ridicul qu'il sont fort injuste. les françois sont communément fort peu instruit des affaires politiques, et ce pendons ils en parlent sans saisse, et ces sans sçavoir un mot de ce dont ils parlent, ils sont donc furieux de ce que les anglois nous on batue, et je leur dis mais ces anglois ne vous auroit rien dit si vous vous étié tenue en repos, c'est vous qui avez attaqué, votre guerre est injuste, cest comme si on parloit a des sourd, comme ils n'ecoûte point, ils ne repondent point, et continue leur rabacherie, dont j'ay été si ennuiée que j'ay quitté paris avec plaisir pour venir a la campagne reposer ma tête de tout leur sot raisonnements, et en faire avec moimême qui me remêtré du calme dans l'ame, et cest pour y mètre de plus de la douceur, et de lagrément, que je cause si long tems avec vous monsieur, j'ay véritablement du plaisir de m'antretenir avec vous, et qu'and je vous écrit je crois que je suis en conversation cest une illusion agréable a la qu'elle je me livre entierement,

Dite moy si vous avez vue mr cératie, et si vous l'avèz gardé longtems,

Je n'ay point encore reçu ce que vous envoyé a mr de secondat,

Soièz bien persuadé monsieur que je ne vous oublie point avec tous nos amis commun, quand nous nous trouvons rassemblé nous feson toujours mention de vous avec beaucoup dèloges, et par concéquand avec bien du plaisir, jen nay un vife toutes les fois que je dis de vous tout ce que j'en pense,

je vous prie de dire a mon cher chevalier⁴ de ma part les choses du monde les plus tendres, dite luy aussi que cest par discretion que je ne luy écrit pas, la première aucasion que je trouverai de luy écrire surement je ne la manquerai pas, et comme je luy écrit rarement je luy écrirai une lettre bien longue, jéspere que vous vous voiez quelques fois, je vouderois bien vous voire l'un et laûtre en ce païs, et je vouderois bien pouvoir aller dans le vôtre, véritablement j'en n'ay envie, mais on n'a tant de petit liens qui réunie ensemble font une si grosse chaine qu'on ne peut la rompe et en gémissant du jouc on reste dessus, apres la santé, la liberté est le plus grand de tous les biens, tous les hommes le désire et font cependant sans saisse tout ce qu'il faut pour n'en point avoir on ne fait rien qui ne vous éloigne de ce bien, lamitié même qui est de toutes les chaines la plus douce, et la plus légère, est cependant un lien qui nous arête, je sens que j'orois véritablement du plaisir d'aller

⁴ Schaub.

vous-voire, et mon cher chevalier, mais j'orois en même temps bien de la peine a quitter mes amis avec qui je vis, en fin tout est contradiction en cette vie, même nos sentiments, le même qui nous fait désirer une chose nous empeche de la faire, il faut ce soumettre sous cette loy générale de la nature, aimons nous, cela consolle de tout, même de vivre,

adieu monsieur je ne veux pas moraliser plus long tems de peure de tomber dans le pot au noir, et pour reprendre du gaie, je veux vous répéter ce que je vous ay déjas dit tant de fois, et ce que je vous répéterai toute ma vie, que je vous aime de tout mon coeur, et que je vous embrasse bien tendrement

mille amitie a mademoiselle vôte fille

VI

November 20, [1743]

MS Folkes I, No. 61.

Address, seal and postmark missing.

ce 20 novemb.

il y a trois mois que je suis a la campagne, je compte d'y rester encore jusqu'au dix de décembre, je voulois atandre monsieur a avoir l'honneur de vous écrire, que je fusse de retour a paris, pour pouvoir vous mander quelques nouvelles de littérature, mais lennuie d'être si longtemps sans sçavoir de vos nouvelles m'a gagné, et j'aime mieu n'avoir que peut de chose a vous dire, que de ne vous rien dire du tout.

je commence monsieur par vous demander comment vous vous porté, que faite vous, éte vous a la ville, ou a la campagne, voyéz vous quelques fois nôtre chevalier,¹ j'ay prie la liberté de vous adresser sous l'envelope de mr de mairan une lettre pour luy, il y a environ deux mois et demy, cest un nommé mr fitzgéral² qui cétoit chargé du paquet, j'espere qu'il vous aura été rendu, et que vous aurai eu la bonté de faire remêtre la lettre au chevalier.

on ma mandé de paris que mr labbé sérati y étoit de retour,³ je vouderois bien qu'il y resta jusqu'au mien, pour avoir le plaisir de parler de vous avec luy, cest une des chose du monde que j'aime d'avantage, que de parler de mes amis a des gens qui les conoisse, les aime, et les estime, et je suis bien sur monsieur de trouver ces sentiments dans tout ceux qui vous auront vue, de sentrétenir de ces amis, d'en dire ce que l'on en pense n'augeunte pas ce que

¹ Schaub.

² It has not been possible to identify this personage.

³ Cerati writes to folkes, November 29, 1743: "J'ai trouvé parti de Paris pour Bordeaux Mr le Président de Montesquieu. . . . Mme. Geoffrin n'est pas encore de retour de la campagne." (Folkes MS I, 60.)

lon sens pour eux, mais cela fait une petite nourriture si douce pour l'amitié, que cest pour moy un des plus grand plaisir qu'elle me procure, je le crois même plus délicat que celui de les voir, cette façon de penser vas vous paroître bien ridicule, et bien extraordinaire, mais il faut que vous me passiez le bavardage dans cette lettre, je vous ay dit en la commensent, que je n'avois aucun faits intéressant a vous dire, faute de pouvoir vous dire ce qui ce passe dans le monde, je vous entretiendrai de ce qui ce passe dans ma tête, a condition que vous y ferai peut d'attention, et que vous n'i répondrai point, j'ay envie de causer, avec qui pui-je saticefair ce désir avec moins d'inconvénient qu'avec vous, vous êtes remplie monsieur de bonté et d'indulgence pour moy, quai-je a craindre,

je vais donc aller mon train, et reprendre ma proposition pour me faire entendre si je puit.

je dis donc, que je crois quil y a plus de délicatesse, et que le coeur est plus saticefait dans le plaisir de parler de ces amis que dans celui de les voir, dans ce luy ci, les sens y trouve plus leur compte que le coeur, voir, embrasser, parler, sont des sensations corporel, mais dire ce que l'on sent, et ce que lon pense de son amy est une sensation spirituel dont on fait peut d'usage quan on n'est en sa présence, les louanges les plus vray on toujours l'air de la fadeur quand on les donne en face, plus vôtre amy est persuadé de la vérité de ce que vous luy dite, et plus il est embarrassé, et son embarras vous en donne, quelque art que vous employiez pour assésouer vos louanges il ne vas jamais a faire passer la répétition, insie quand vous avez azardé une fois avec beaucoup de ménagement de dire a vôtre amy tout ce que vous trouvez en luy d'aimable et d'estimable il faut en rester la et il ne vous ay plus permie que de vous laisser deviner, mais plus de vous expliquer,

je revien donc a dire que la présence de ces amis ne saticefait que les sens corporel,

et que le coeur ne ce répend sans contrainte que quand il parle d'eux, a un tier,

j'oublois encor de dire qu'un des grands inconvénient de dire en face a son amy tout ce que l'on pense de luy, cest que vos louanges n'on jamais l'air désintéressée, il est forcé de vous payer sur le champ et d'enchérir sur vous, et des ce moment il faut ce taire, pour ce sauver du plat, et du fade,

mais ce que lon dit dun amy a un aître amy, et tout gratui vous vou livray a tout vôtre sentiment sans aucun ménagement, ni pour vous, parce qu'il ne peut point être suscepecte quan il ce manifeste en l'absence de celui qui l'inspire, ni pour celui qui vous écoute, parce que vous ne demandé de luy que de vous écouter,

je me suis sentie quelques fois dans une espèce d'hivresse⁴ en parlant des gens que j'aimois cela me fesoit un état délicieux, et en m'y livrant de tout mon cœur, je sentois bien, que je n'aurois jamais pu leur dire à eux même, tout ce que je venois de dire d'eux.

mais comme la métaphysique doit toujours s'édifier sur le physique, je crois monsieur malgré tout mon galimatias, que je serois encore plus satisfaite de vous voir que de parler de vous, et je ne sèrie avec empressement toutes les occasions de m'entretenir de vous que pour me consoler de ne vous point voir,

voilà une petite dissertation sur des pierres⁵ que mr de secondat a trouvée dans une fontaine d'eaux minérales, qu'il a faite, et qu'il m'a chargée de vous envoyer,

je n'ay pas encore reçu, la commission que vous avez eu la bonté de faire pour luy,⁶ ni les médailles que vous m'avez promise,

mr le président de montesquieu a gagné à notre parlement un procès⁷ considérable, qui duroit de puis un très grand nombre d'années, il étoit question des limites d'une de ces terres, ce procès l'a occupé et tourmenté considérablement, la joie qu'il a eu de le gagner a été très vive, il est allé à bordeaux triomphant,⁸ il y passera l'hiver, maupertuis est à St malos lieu de sa naissance je crois qu'il reviendra incessamment, mr de fontenelle ce porte bien

Mr de mairan aussi, il vient de finir sa carrière de directeur de l'académie par trois éloges, celui du cardinal de fleury, celui du labbé bignon, et celui de mr lémery, ils ont été tous les trois applaudis, mais le dernier a eu la préférence.⁹

⁴ Mme. Geoffrin first wrote *hyvresse*, then *hyvraille*, crossed them both out and replaced them by the form in the letter.

⁵ In the *Philosophical Transactions*, No. 472, for January to April 1744, p. 26, is a paper, "Remarks on stones of a regular figure found near Bagnères in Gascony, with other observations communicated by Mr Secondat de Montesquieu (*sic*) of the Academy of Sciences of Bordeaux in a letter to Martin Folkes, Esquire, Pres. R. S." A marginal comment indicates that this was "read Mar. 8. 1743-4." There is no doubt this is the "dissertation" referred to here.

⁶ In letters dated 16 February 1743 and 26 May 1743, Secondat had asked folkes for two things: first for a hydrostatic balance, and later for a copy of a new book by Joshua Gee, *The Trade and Navigation of Great Britain considered*. A translation of this work was published by Secondat in London in 1749, under the title *Considerations sur le commerce et la navigation de la Grande Bretagne*.

⁷ Cf. Gebelin et Morize; *La Correspondance de Montesquieu* (Paris, Champion, 1914): Aug. 10, 1731 (I, 290), Feb. 12, 1732 (I, 292), Mar. 27, 1732 (I, 294), June 1, 1743 (I, 391). The lawsuit had been brought first before the parliament of Bordeaux and later was referred to the parliament of Paris.

⁸ Cf. Letter VI, note 3.

⁹ In his letter of September 1, 1743, to Folkes, Mairan had written concerning these eulogies: "J'en lirai encore trois à la rentrée de la St. Martin, parmi les quels il y en a un qui en vaut quatre pour la difficulté. C'est un vrai fagot d'épines à manier, et je serai fort heureuse si je m'en tire les mains nettes. Combien un cardinal ministre quelque louable qu'il soit est-il plus difficile à louer que M. Halley, lorsqu'on ne veut pas donner dans les lieux communs rebatus des louanges outrées!" (Folkes MS I, 41.)

vous connoisse surement de réputation labbè desfontaines,¹⁰ qui fesoit des feuilles périodiques, dans les quels il fesoit une espespe de critiques de tous les nouveaux ouvrages qui paroissoit, il est interdit, cest une perte pour la littérature, car quois qu'il y eut souvent bien de la malice dans ces critiques et souvent même des maneries et des calomenie, le gros avoit bien de l'utilité, cest une perte pour le pais étranger, ce qui a aucasionè sa disgrace a été premierment une lettre anonime, ou il a mi en poussier le discour de maupertuis a lacademie françoise, et celuy de moncrif,¹¹ et en sécond lieu des nottes qu'il a mi a une nouvelle traduction de virgille¹² qu'il a faite, il a écorché toute l'academie françoise, et mr de fontenelle sur tout,

les sçavant sont plus hommes, que les hommes ordinaires, cela diminue la grande consideration que lon deveroit naturellement avoir pour le sçavoir, et consolle ceux qui n'an nont point, de n'an point avoir, la sçience ne donne point de vertue, elle n'aûte point les vices, elle ne les diminue seullement pas, elle n'est point un rempart contre les fébloisses de l'humanité en fin elle laisse les hommes tels qu'elle les trouvent, tout son seul mérite est donc de mètre dans un plus grand jour celuy des hommes qui la cultivent, mais aussi elle éclaire leur défaut,

cela fait en vèrite que tout est presque égal, et que tout est bien comme dit pope,

adieu monsieur pourvue que je continue a vous paroître bien,
je me trouverai bien,

je remersie Melle vôtre fille de la bonne opinion qu'elle a de moy
je l'embrasse de tout mon coeur

la miene est a la campagne de son côté

¹⁰ Pierre-François Guyot Desfontaines, 1685-1745, in Paris after 1724 as editor of the *Journal des Savants*, created a storm of protest by his immoderate and biting critical judgements, the most important of which are contained in *Le Nouvelliste du Parnasse*, 1730-1732; *Les Observations sur les ouvrages nouveaux*, 1735-1743; and *Le Dictionnaire néologique*, 1726. He was also widely known as a translator of Swift, Pope, Horace, Ovid, Virgil, and others.

¹¹ François-Augustin Paradis de Moncrif, 1687-1770, poet, composer, actor, playwright, and member of the Académie Française. Moncrif was successively secretary to the Comte d'Argenson, the Comte-abbé de Clermont, from whom he received several benefices, Maria Leczinska, Queen of France 1725-1768, and royal censor and tutor to the dauphine. His best known works include *L'Oracle de Delphes*, 1722, and *l'Histoire des Chats*, dissertation sur la prééminence des chats dans la société; sur les autres animaux d'Egypte; sur les distinctions et privilèges dont ils ont joui personnellement; sur le traitement honorable qu'on leur faisoit pendant leur vie, et des monuments et autels qu'on leur dressoit après leur mort, avec plusieurs pièces qui y ont rapport, Paris, 1727, 1748.

¹² *Les Œuvres de Virgile*, a translation with notes, Paris, 1743, 4 vols.

[VII]

Geoffrin to Guérin, bookseller.¹

Inscribed in another hand at top of page: Remis le 13. janvier 1744 / au Laquais de me Geoffrin / du pour port 4¹¹6s.//

Mr Folkes m'avait mandé il y a long tems que vous aviez une boîte a me remêtre de sa part, Mr labbé Salier² ma dit monsieur il y a deux jours de vôtre part que je pouvois l'aller chercher, si vous vouliez bien monsieur la remêtre au present porteur je vous cerois tres obligé, et cette lettre vous servira de reçu, si vous voulé absolument me la remêtre a moymême faite moi dire a qu'elle heur on vous trouve chez vous, nos quartiers sont si éloigné qu'il ni a pas moien de risquer de faire une cource inutil mais si vous voulîés bien donner la boîte a celuy qui vous remêtera cette lettre cela ceroit le plus court, et je vous en ceroit tres obligé, je suis tres parfaitement monsier vôtre tres onble et obeissante servante

Geoffrin

Si on ne vous trouvoit pas chez vous monsieur quand on vous portera cette lettre et que vous voulussiez bien me fair sçavoir vôtre réponse mon adresse est rue St honoré vis avis les capucins

ce jeudy matin

Brown University

¹ This letter is number 2079 in the catalogue of *Lettres autographes composant la collection de M. Alfred Bovet décrites par Etienne Charavay* . . . Paris, 1885. I print it here because of its association with Martin folkes, and the possibility that through some error in dating it may refer to the Norden drawings mentioned in the first two letters printed above. The relative inaccessibility of the Bovet catalogue may perhaps excuse this reprinting of a document already known in facsimile.

² This may be a reference to the Abbé Claude Sallier, 1685-1761, philologist, member of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres and of the Académie française; F. R. S., and member of the Berlin Academy. Professor of Hebrew in the Collège de France, *Garde des Manuscrits* in the Bibliothèque Royale, he was the author of numerous dissertations in the *Mémoires de L'Académie des Inscriptions*, and assisted with the *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque Royale*, 1739-1753.

BOOK REVIEWS

Religious Lyrics of the XVth Century. Edited by CARLETON BROWN.
Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939. Pp. xxxi+394. 10s. 6d.

Religious Lyrics of the XVth Century is the third and final volume of the series beginning with the appearance in 1924 of *Religious Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century*. It is difficult, if not altogether impossible, to consider the present volume apart from the preceding two and from the arduous preliminary labor represented by Professor Brown's well known two-volume *Register*, without which any thorough study of Middle English verse would be a wearisome and heartbreaking task.

Uniform with the other two volumes in format (except that in the present case the sides of the MS leaves are indicated by *ro* and *vo* instead of by *a* and *b*), this volume differs from them chiefly in arranging the poems according to topic, in the number of pieces printed (192), and in the number of new poems presented. Seventy-four of the lyrics are here printed for the first time.

The poems, like those in the other volumes, are well chosen, ranging in length from four lines to two hundred lines, and including moral as well as strictly religious pieces. The book gives enough of each kind adequately to illustrate the various themes of fifteenth century religious poetry. Above that, the poems are interesting and intelligible to general readers as well as to Middle English specialists. In fact, whereas many would find Lydgate and Occleve difficult, even readers untrained in Middle English can understand and feel the charm of such lyrics as Numbers 126-129, 132-134, and many others in the book.

Number 110 provides a particularly interesting illustration of the extent to which worldly language was employed in dealing with sacred subjects. The Latin title *Querimonia Xi [Christi] languentis pro amore* gives us our only hint that the poem is religious. It could be read and understood as a secular lyric; and that it actually was so understood at some time is perhaps suggested by the four lines which follow the Latin couplet in the MS:

Where I loue I love right wele
& where I kysse I loue some deele
But where I rage I loue ryghte noughte
ffor where Pat I love is alle my thoughte

Through his notes and his glossary of obsolete words, Professor Brown has done much to make the texts understandable to the non-specialist. Only one who has essayed a similar task or who is able to compare some of the printed texts with the originals can fully appreciate the work represented by the textual apparatus. In this, he

has endeavored both to make the poems intelligible and to give the reader as clear an idea of the actual MS forms as possible. When a poem occurs in several MSS, he has always consulted all the other accessible texts in emending or restoring the text. He has also, of course, been careful to list the variants; and when the several MSS differ widely he has gone into considerable detail to make the differences clear and to account for them.

It is when he is dealing with an unique text, though, that we see Professor Brown's editorial skill at its best. How scrupulously he avoids unnecessary or arbitrary emendation may be seen in his note to line 22 of Number 66. In various places he has had to rearrange words or lines occurring out of place through scribal error or carelessness. To appreciate his ingenuity in handling such a problem, one should observe what the editor has done with lines 7-9 in Number 65. Finally, how far he has gone to help the common reader understand the poems by explaining the syntax is admirably illustrated by his note on lines 13, 14 of Number 173, which read:

Beste be truste, wythowghton any nay
Sonest may them-selffe be-tray

This somewhat difficult passage is simplified by the following note, p. 344:

13-14 Elliptical cstr.: (Those who are) best by trust [i.e., are held in highest esteem] may soonest betray themselves.

If his treatment of the dozen or so poems of whose MSS there are photostat copies in the University of Washington collection is any criterion, equal care has been shown in the rendering of the MSS. Here the editor has shown the same fidelity to the original as in his other two volumes. It is indeed unfortunate that one of the few mistakes in printing, somehow inevitable in such a work as this, should have occurred in one of the most charming poems in the entire collection, Number 132, a prayer to the guardian angel. Lines 33-36 are printed as follows.

Suffre not the fende blake
With [s]cornis ne with wanhope
Neyther my mynde fro me to take
My sowle to see.

As it is given, the last line does not make sense. This must be an error in printing, since the photostat shows plainly that the last word is not *see*, but *slee* (slay).

Again, in lines 18, 20 of Number 110, the printed text gives *riches* and *moche* as rime-fellows. Apparently a part of the marginal scribal lines indicating the rimes has been read as a *z*. *Riche* is the better reading, since it more nearly rimes with *moche*. Nevertheless, in a field of scholarship where it is all too easy to make errors in reading and where frequently there is no final answer but only opin-

ion, there are comparatively few places where one might disagree with Professor Brown's readings.

Two points, however, are not clear. First, why does the paging of the pieces from Cambridge University Library MS II. 6.43 differ from that in the *Register*? Numbers 61, 132, and 49, for example, which are listed in the *Register* as occurring as fols. 87b, 96b, and 118b respectively, are here given as fols. 89vo, 98vo, and 120vo. Second, it is sometimes difficult to discover what principle the editor observes in expanding MS abbreviations; he seems somewhat inconsistent in his treatment of the curled *n*, the curled *r*, and the crossed *ll*. In a single poem he treats these symbols differently; sometimes, apparently, they indicate an omitted final *e*, and sometimes they do not. That the Middle English scribes themselves used these signs deliberately may be inferred from a line crossed out and then rewritten in the MS of Number 73. The first version of the line uses the crossed *ll*: "And aȝl wykyd. . ." The rewritten line reads, "And alle wykyd. . .," indicating that sometimes, at any rate, the crossed *ll* indicated an omitted final *e*.

Also, it might have been worth while to mention that in the MS, Number 93 is provided with a musical score at the bottom of the first page.

The poems are, as was said above, representative of the period and interesting in themselves. More of such work as Professor Brown's needs to be done. There is still a good deal of unprinted Middle English material in both prose and verse which ought to be brought out. Besides this, much of what has already appeared ought to be collected, and studied, and reprinted in the light of present-day scholarship. And these three volumes by Carleton Brown will, as they should, serve as an inspiration and a model to future editors of Middle English texts.

HENRY A. PERSON

University of Washington

The Invisible World: A Study of Pneumatology in Elizabethan Drama. By ROBERT HUNTER WEST. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1939. Pp. xi+275.

A valuable addition to those studies which have applied Elizabethan pneumatology to the various parts of Elizabethan literature, this investigation applies pneumatology to a field hitherto unworked by scholars interested in the relation between this doctrine and literature. Mr. West's aim is to scrutinize the ghosts in the plays of Shakespeare's contemporaries—ghosts and related daemonic figures with their dependent human pursuits, ceremonial magic and witchcraft—and to elucidate these spirit findings by specific references to actual pneumatological literature of the sixteenth century, "to

uncover the *sense* of the dialogue and action concerned with spirits." He further explains: "My attempt is not to say 'from this pneumatology the play draws,' but 'to this pneumatology the play perhaps appeals'" (p. viii). This cautious approach was rewarded by the discovery in many plays of very close relationships between spirit phenomena in the play world and outside contemporary spirit doctrine; and if these closer relationships were not evident, there was always demonstrable a generalized rationale which at least pointed to the sixteenth century pneumatology.

Though Mr. West claims no contribution to the study of pneumatological doctrine and its history, his exposition of this material is useful apart from its application to the plays. One finds in the first three chapters a survey of Elizabethan source-books on spirit doctrine; the material is organized around controversial matters and according to the various schools of thought on these matters. Whether the schools as such were clearly known to Elizabethans, the distinctions between them certainly existed. The existence of daemons, ghosts, witchcraft, and magic was a commonplace matter of faith with most Elizabethans; less commonplace were the fine controversial points on the doctrine surrounding these matters of faith; probably only among the polemicists themselves was there an awareness that the terms "occult," "orthodox," or "rationalistic" might be attached to their arguments. And if the distinctions between these terms were not sharply marked for the Elizabethans, at least they could have been, implicit as they were in all pneumatological writing, and consequently reflected in the plays.

By "orthodox" West refers not only to Catholic orthodoxy as found in Jean Bodin, Pierre Le Loyer, Noel Taillepied and others, but also that of Protestant writers like King James, William Perkins, Lewis Lavater; in general religious doctrine the two schools are reasonably close, and both are far from the "occult" point of view found in Henry Cornelius Agrippa, *Three Books of Occult Philosophy*, and in manuals of magic. The occult is explained as the

esoteric, half-mystical style of interpretation which, it has been said, contributed in its own way to the rise of science and the break up of the 'rationalistic dogmatism' of the Middle Ages. The magician's approach to spirit lore allowed for imaginative conceptions and for an experimentation which proved productive, though not in the direction it was aimed. (P. 212.)

The "rationalistic" school, named after Lecky's use of the word, played down the miraculous causes and searched for natural explanations for all kinds of phenomena. Reginald Scot is the plainest example of the rationalistic school, although West would emphasize the basic authoritative orthodoxy which he finds in Reginald Scot's work. He thinks there is no real ground for King James's assertion that Scot denied spirits and hence that there is no real skeptic among the Elizabethan pneumatologists. Most of the authors considered, he says, feel called upon to declare the essentiality of

spirits as if there were skeptics, however. And that it was then a matter of moment is shown by King James's suppression of Reginald Scot's *Discovery* because he was a writer "on the other side of the question," that is—that he did not believe in spirits. A good case can be made in support of King James's reaction: Mr. West should have given greater emphasis to the perfunctory nature of Scot's acknowledgments of the existence and powers of spirits. They are not so convincing as his skeptical temper and twentieth century incredulity in spirit matters.

Classification according to various schools of thought is never independent of the arrangement according to controversial matters. Spirits and their control over man, the nature of spectres, lawfulness of ceremonial magic, moral culpability of witches, and all the attendant questions are carefully presented with the various points of view held about them, the schools then showing up in such discussions. With this method, then, Mr. West builds up a body of knowledge to which he refers his instances in the plays for comparison. The chapters dealing directly with the plays are again organized around the central questions of daemonic names, places and rank, powers and purposes of daemons, ceremonial magic, witchcraft, and ghosts.

Some of his generalizations about the presence of animistic material in the plays are interesting apart from the relation of that material to the outside world.

Although animistic material in Elizabethan drama has a history virtually co-extensive with that drama's, it does not appear in its most characteristic form earlier than the middle years of the 1580's when Marlowe's *Faustus* brought the "practising magician" on the stage for the first time and Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* began the native tradition in the treatment of ghosts. (P. 57.)

Mr. West finds that the diabolical pact (between the witch or magician and the daemon who performed services for him) received serious handling long after the practising magician did; the daemon, who was preserved by the witch plays and a satirical vogue, never figured greatly in tragedy; the play ghosts, on the contrary, were prominent figures in tragedy, rare in comedy. Only one author makes a telling use of skepticism in interpreting daemonic works as psychological disturbances—Webster in *The Duchess of Malfi*. The supernatural is not excluded, but the readiest rationale of the three incidents involved is naturalistic.

The worth of his findings is clearly shown in the relating of the above generalizations about the plays to the body of pneumatological doctrine.

The characteristic Elizabethan dramatic treatment of ghosts and daemons which began with *Faustus* and *The Spanish Tragedy* was largely a matter of escape from literary tradition and of consequent heightened verisimilitude; that is, of increased reference of the play to the actual contemporary world. It was most fully and rapidly realized in the magician plays both because

Marlowe's independent genius achieved it at a blow and because the magician plays had the lighter and less tenacious tradition to escape from. After *Faustus*, magic and daemons in tragedies, though sometimes approximate or fanciful in details, conform in general to the notions of their day about the nature of such things in the actual world. . . . Analogous conformity of the ghosts in the period's plays is much less pronounced. (Pp. 58-59.)

The importance of this particular relation between the Elizabethan notions about spirits and Elizabethan literature is amply demonstrated not only by West's *Invisible World* but also by the increasing number of scholars who have interested themselves in it since Spaulding's essay on Elizabethan daemonology.

MARGARET BUSHNELL

University of Washington

The Art and Life of William Shakespeare. By HAZELTON SPENCER.
New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1940. \$2.25.

Whenever literature returns to the human spirit for its inspiration, Shakespeare, according to Mr. Spencer, comes to the front again. Since that is what is happening today on the stage, screen and radio, the time seems ripe to him for a new book on Shakespeare.

Professor Spencer does not present any newly discovered material on the poet's life, nor does he often differ from the currently accepted views on Shakespeare's art. He is, as he says, simply compiling and selecting from a large body of fact and inference and, while he does not hesitate to express his own opinions, apparently has no special axe to grind. The merit of the book, therefore, rests largely upon the selection and organization of the material.

The general arrangement is excellent. The first two chapters deal with Shakespeare's life and his medium and the last nine with the plays. The emphasis is thus where it should be—on the plays themselves. These are conveniently grouped under the following headings: experimental comedies, earlier and later histories, trial tragedies, the best comedies, realistic comedies, the four great tragedies, the last tragedies and the dramatic romances. Each play is discussed in relation to its origin, structure and subsequent stage history, the various aspects of Shakespeare's art being handled as they arise in connection with the plays.

The audience for whom a book is intended is an important factor in the selection of material. Since Professor Spencer states that his book is written primarily for the inquisitive layman and less experienced student it seems fair to regard it as a hand-book for undergraduates and to examine it with their interests and needs in mind. The map of London, the many excellent and carefully chosen illustrations, the simple but adequate account of Shakespeare's life

and medium, relegating to the notes at the end most of the technical and controversial points, the sane and human comments upon the plays and the easy and for the most part readable style are all points which should recommend the book to the student. Indeed, so much in the book is interesting and useful to readers of this class that it is unfortunate that the author could not have kept them more consistently in view. That he often considers them exclusively is evident from his careful explanation of comparatively simple facts. Occasionally, as in his description of blank-verse, he even underestimates his readers' knowledge, while now and then, in his use of slang and colloquial phrases, he too obviously caters to them.

But these after all are minor points. The chief criticism of the book, from the standpoint of the college student, is the inclusion of material which the author himself suggests will probably be skipped. I would guess that the comments on Donne would hold little interest for the average student and be reasonably sure that the long accounts of the stage-history of the plays and of the actors, especially those who occupied the boards between Shakespeare's day and the immediate present, would receive scant attention. On the other hand much material of genuine interest has been glossed over or omitted. Quartos and folios, pirated editions, the differences between the modern and sixteenth century stage are mentioned but not adequately explained, while important social and political problems of the time are completely neglected. Not only is there no discussion of Elizabethan psychology but there is no reference in the notes or elsewhere to the excellent treatises on the subject by Ruth Lelia Anderson and Lily B. Campbell.

Although the style is, on the whole, clear and easy there is some tendency to over-stylization and a few examples of confused and hurried writing. The latter is especially apparent in the account of the *Comedy of Errors* where the reader is left in some doubt as to Professor Spencer's opinion. Does he or does he not believe that Shakespeare was a teacher and that *Errors* was his first play? On one page he says, "If he was ever a pedagogue, this comedy is probably his first surviving piece, but it seems more likely that he was already an actor when he penned it," and a few pages later adds, "It is the stylistic poverty of *Errors* which stamps it as in all probability the first of Shakespeare's surviving plays."

Professor Spencer does not hesitate to give his own ideas which, for the most part, are so refreshing and impartial that an occasional tendency to preach and a dogmatic treatment of certain questions are all the more regrettable. But after all whoever dares to voice his own opinions is open to disagreement and, on the whole, it is pleasant to turn from the objectivity of Stoll to a subjective and human interpretation which only now and then becomes sentimental and whimsical.

HELEN ANDREWS KAHIN

University of Washington

The Pastoral Elegy: An Anthology. Edited with Introduction, Commentary, and Notes by THOMAS PERRIN HARRISON, JR., with English Translations by HARRY JOSHUA LEON. Austin, Texas: The University of Texas, 1939. Pp. 312. \$2.50.

Professor Harrison's selection of twenty-three poets to represent the Greek, Roman, Italian, French, and English pastoral elegy furnishes a useful compilation of source materials for the study of classical and continental backgrounds of English poetry, presenting comparative materials rather than an all-inclusive survey. The highly selective collection effectively shows the continuity of elegy, which alone of pastoral types is distinct from the *Daphnis* of Theocritus to the English *Thyrsis*, and exhibits the constant elements which formulate the most accurate definition of the species. While Professor Harrison states that "the intrinsic worth of a poem, its representative aspects, and the reputation of the author," were also considered, it is apparent that the anthology is primarily a selection complementary to the scholarship which has already determined the correlation of English pastorals with classical and continental prototypes, and that as such it exceeds the simpler purpose of a survey, for which, nevertheless, it will undoubtedly be widely used.

The arrangement supports a thesis that pure elegy reaches an end in *Lycidas*: "Hence, in great measure all Milton's predecessors are regarded by comparison, by contrast, and by direct contribution as leading the way to *Lycidas*." In this he follows and acknowledges J. H. Hanford ("The Pastoral Elegy and Milton's *Lycidas*," *PMLA*, 1910) whose analysis largely determines the selection of materials. Inclusions are further limited in accordance with Professor Harrison's belief in the "distinct continental origin" of the pastoral tradition from which Spenser drew, so that there is a loading of the anthology with Neo-Latinist, Italian, and French elegy, which is withal a good emphasis. His sense of relationships existing between the English pastorals is apparent, particularly in his selection of Drummond solely to represent the period between Spenser and Milton. Drummond's paraphrase of Castiglione's *Alcon* is an important link in the tradition which the editor recognizes, and *Tears on the Death of Mæliades* he accepts as sufficiently Spenserian for presenting a poetic tradition which could better be traced in itself through other imitators. Hanford's discounting of Browne's Fourth Eclogue of the *Shepherd's Pipe* and other intermediary sources beyond Spenser as influences upon Miltonic pastoral elegy would justify this choice. In its agreement with established opinions the anthology seems to be an extension and fortification of scholarly works which have ascribed as sources of English pastoral most of the selections here included.

Radbart's *Eclogue by Two Nuns* has been carefully analyzed as typical of the obscure medieval elegy which endowed the *genre* with the important Christian-Shepherd metaphor and other aspects

of church satire. Like other sections which do not lie directly within the sphere of greatest interest, the period formative of the elegy as continued in Petrarch is briefly treated, but Professor Harrison's emphasis upon Radbert is a somewhat unique and a valuable contribution to the study of pastoral. Likewise the section on the aftermath of Milton presents a minimum of poetry but contains distinct contributions, both in the familiar analysis of Shelley and the evaluations of English lyric pastoral. The notes upon Arnold's realistic portrayal of nature are significant.

Ample notes for each work include commentary, parallel citation, biographical fact, bibliography of works of comment, and a listing of text and other editions. Texts employed are standard. The contribution of Professor Leon, Associate Professor of Classical Languages at the University of Texas, whose translations parallel the foreign texts, has great value in giving a wide range of usefulness to the source book which Professor Harrison has provided for the study of pastoral elegy.

There are, it would seem, aspects of the pastoral more obscure than elegy, therefore more deserving of exploration by those who like Professor Harrison have the power. Outstanding work has been devoted to elegy and was at hand. The sources of didactic and romantic pastoral in English poetry have not been related, although all sources must bear one upon the other, the accepted segregation of types notwithstanding.

The book appears in standard format. A facsimile page of the November Eclogue of the *Shepherd's Calendar* with an illustrative woodcut is appropriately included as frontispiece. Even in this detail Professor Harrison is thoughtful in including typical motif of the elegy, but it is to be remarked that he uses the 1591 edition conveniently at hand in the Wrenn Library rather than the 1579 edition.

ELIZABETH ARTIS WATTS

University of Washington

Edmund Burke and His Literary Friends. By DONALD CROSS BRYANT. St. Louis: Washington University Studies (New Series, Language and Literature, No. 9), 1939. Pp. 323. \$2.75.

There is today bibliographically visible a minor boom in Burke. One seeking a general cause for this interest might hazard an opinion that some people, having lost faith in Liberalism of the Voltaire-Paine ancestry, have been moved to re-examine the literary sources of the Conservative-Traditionalist strain and thus have come to the *Reflections*. A much more specific and direct cause is undoubtedly the uncovering in recent years of considerable hitherto unworked source material bearing on Burke's life and works, together with the exploitation of this material by scholars of high productivity. The

work of Thomas W. Copeland and Dixon Wecter is especially to be noted.

Comes now Professor Byrant with a valuable, but not highly original, study of the personal and literary relations of Burke with Johnson, Reynolds, Boswell, Garrick, Goldsmith, and many lesser figures of the Club and the Burkian coterie. He has carefully and critically extracted from all the available sources the material that will relevantly fit into the chapters, or lesser divisions, concerned with Burke's particular friends or acquaintances. So much of Burke's social and intellectual intercourse was prandial—and seldom *a deux*—that there is, perforce, considerable repetition; the same dinner is served in successive chapters.

Professor Bryant anticipates notice of the omission in his gathering of such names as those of Paine, Wilkes, Francis, Wilberforce and Franklin, and justifies the omission by the statement that they "at least in their associations with Burke. . . were not strictly literary figures." Added is the remark that he may later publish, in other forms, studies of the Burkian relations with these men. In the light of some of the figures he does see fit to include, it seems to me that the second explanation would be better if left standing alone.

There are occasions, but not many, where he falls into the biographer's great temptation of filling in lacunae with pleasant but gratuitous conjecture, of the sort that almost always gives itself away with the not too compelling word "must." "This treatise must later have formed the core of much good conversation, of which there is no longer any record, on aesthetics and art" (p. 97).

But while this book does not add to our knowledge of Burke any significant, new, interpretation of the man, his works, or his influence on subsequent political thought and action, it does gather together in one place extremely valuable and useful material. Here the student, seeking to examine the close, personal, environmental factors surrounding Burke, has a good part of his work done for him.

DONALD CORNU

University of Washington

John Keats and the Sonnet Tradition: A Critical and Comparative Study. By LAWRENCE JOHN ZILLMAN. Los Angeles: Lyman-house, 1940. Pp. 209. Cloth, \$3.00; paper, \$2.25.

Besides illuminating the architectonic features of Keats's sonnets, this brief volume gives valuable information concerning the general technique of the sonnet form.

Pointing out that in the early nineteenth century there was no such body of critical legislation dealing with the sonnet as exists today, Mr. Zillman sensibly remarks: "In fairness to the poet, then, we must approach the examination of Keats's sonnets not through

a narrow dogma, but through his own background." The first section of the present study surveys this background and pays particular attention to such English contributors to the sonnet as Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, Bowles, Wordsworth, and Hunt because of their possible influence on Keats. Mr. Zillman concludes that the major influence was that of Hunt.

Part Two of *John Keats and the Sonnet Tradition* is entitled "A Critical and Comparative Study." In this section, under four main headings (I. Form and Content, II. Melody, III. Metrical Variations, IV. Phrasing), Mr. Zillman discusses such elements of the poet's craft as themes, rime schemes, exact rimes, rimes approximate in sound and in accent, alliteration, assonance, sound echoes, refrain, parallelism, variants from the normal iambic pentameter, end-stopped verses, run-on lines, and phrase lengths. Tables comparing Keats's use of these elements with the uses of the six other poets previously mentioned tend to confirm the fact that Keats's position is closer to that of Hunt than to that of any of the other writers considered.

In the Conclusion Mr. Zillman states: "in general, Keats followed sonnet custom as he knew it," but, although he "was conservative in his use of the forms he employed, he was not slavish." A brief summary of characteristic elements of Keats's verse-craft is given, and a comparison of the early sonnets (written before March, 1817) with the later reveals an increasing mastery of poetic technique, which makes for "a richer blend of variety within uniformity, and a more skilful adaptation of content to form—the two goals towards which all poets strive." It could be wished that this comparison between the early and later sonnets might have been discussed more fully.

The author supplies two useful appendices to his work. The first is a reprinting of the sixty-seven sonnets of Keats, the inclusion of which is a great convenience to the reader who wishes to make frequent references to them. The second contains the author's findings concerning the sonnet craft of the six poets studied in connection with Keats. These findings are necessarily more tentative than those dealing with the chief subject of the volume. A selected bibliography and an index are also supplied.

Although it does not contain any particularly startling discoveries, *John Keats and the Sonnet Tradition* is to be commended not only for its usefulness but also for the admirable clarity of the style in which it is presented.

EDWARD T. NORRIS

The Johns Hopkins University

The Gathering of the West. By John Galt. Edited with an Introductory Essay and a Glossary by BRADFORD ALLEN BOOTH. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1939. Pp. 107. \$1.50.

The formal occasion for the reprinting of this tale was the centenary anniversary of the death of John Galt, but the real prompting must have been the desire to revive the pleasure of reading a novelist almost unknown to the present generation, and this by way of a story unprinted since 1823 (it appeared originally in *Blackwood's* in 1822). To the question, why read Galt, the introductory essay attempts to supply an answer, together with indicating Galt's place in the history of Scottish vernacular fiction. In his limitations lay his strength, so long as he refrained from breaking faith with his eighteenth century Scotland and the carles, crones, and lairds of his Ayrshire homeland, whose speech, humors, and social outlook he reported with rigid fidelity to the facts of life. His fictional method was biographical, in that, from a mass of well articulated happenings of daily life, it built up a comprehensive personality whom we feel we have lived with from birth to death. As a social recorder of a Scotland that was feeling the impact of industrialism on a slowly yielding tradition, he is invaluable, providing in this respect source material as authentic as that which can be found in the diaries and memoirs of the period.

It is natural to compare Galt and Scott as novelists. But the differences are so obvious that it is needless to set them down. In the matter of prior right to be called the father of Scottish vernacular fiction, Mr. Booth justly awards the claim to Galt. Scott, it was, who impressed the form most acceptably upon the reading public. Mr. Booth also points out that Galt should not be charged with having opened the gates to the swarm of Kailyard fictionists. Between him and Barrie intervene novelists like James Grant, Mrs. Oliphant, George Macdonald, William Black, and Robert Louis Stevenson. Barrie, "Ian MacLaren," and Crockett belong to another world, that of the maidenly sentimental, which insinuated that behind the dour features of every Scotchman was a core of inner sweetness, until George Douglas, with his *The House with the Green Shutters*, disclosed the possibility that this inner core was a heart black-rotten with hate and greed.

The Gathering of the West; or *We're Come to See the King* is a title that is richly suggestive of the historical gatherings of the clans. But the standard that was raised on the Braes of Mar was a signal of rebellion, and the pipes that skirled "My King Has Landed in Moidart" celebrated the arrival of the chief enemy of the House of Hanover. Whereas the standard that floated and flapped in the smoke and rain above the Castle Rock and the pipes that were "blawn amain" up and down High Street proclaimed that Scotland was taking to her bosom the Fourth of the Georges, who on August 14, 1822, arrived on the royal yacht at Leith and on the 15th made

his triumphal entry into Edinburgh. Preceding George IV only one of the Hanoverians had ever set foot in Scotland, namely, the "bloody Butcher," the Duke of Cumberland, who stands to Jacobite Scotland for what Cromwell does to Catholic Ireland. Seventy-seven years before saw another royal entry into Edinburgh, but that was to the taunting tune of "Hey, Johnny Cope, Are You Waukin' Yet," and in the Edinburgh which greeted Bonnie Prince Charlie and his kilted Highlanders,

With sour-faced Whigs the Grassmarket was cramm'd
As if half of the West had set tryst to be hang'd.

Though the Highlanders of '45 were doubtless shaggier, hairier, and dirtier than the kilted regiments that paraded before George IV, yet we may well surmise that the ladies who looked down on the scene from their lofty windows sighed far more tenderly after the handsome figure of the Young Chevalier than could be affirmed of those of 1822 who let their eyes roam over the portly proportions of George IV, gorgeous as he was in the full regalia of the Royal Stuart tartan. Strange to say, it is not beyond probability that on the latter occasion the kilt and bonnet were more in evidence than on the former. All the chiefs of the North were there:

Lord! how the pibrochs groan and yell!
Macdonnell's ta'en the field himsel',
Macleod comes branking o'er the fell—
Carle, now the King's come!

Literally such a program was carried out, and with the greatest of *éclat*, for the stage manager was none other than Sir Walter Scott. Certain it is that no more magnificent display of pageantry and loyalty had for a hundred years before or after been enacted on British soil. Only the heavens were indifferent; they went about their business of raining as if nothing else mattered, even though the ministers were supposed to have "warstled for a sunny day." If one wishes to know more of the banquets, levees, presentations, speeches, and parades, let him read Lockart's *Life of Scott* and Scott's own letters of this date.

If one prefers to be one of the crowd which stood outside in the rain and did the cheering, let him read Galt's *The Gathering of the West*, which introduces us to various town and country folk from the west country who jaunted by canal boat and carriage to "Embro" to see the King. In the company of the M'Auslands and the Goroghans from Greenock, the seamstress from Irvine intent on observing new fashions, radical weavers from Paisley, and burgesses from Glasgow, our feet are upon the solid earth of Scottish respectability. And in their world of little vanities and jealousies, in their attempts to outvie each other in expensive apparel and to secure more advantageous seats, and in their ultimate conciliations, we are made to feel our oneness with the common run of humanity. Mrs. Goroghan got no more sight of the King than the crown of his head as he

passed by, but that was something to be treasured. The story runs pretty much on a constant level of quiet humor, with no turn of satire, although the opportunity must have pressed forward rather conspicuously.

As Mr. Booth remarks, it is not a great story, but it does serve as a pleasant interlude. Of special interest is the dialect, which again, like the humor, is kept well under control. The editor rightly observes that Galt was far more at home with the language of the peasantry than was Scott, whose use of the native speech often smacks of being *learned*. Still it must be remembered that Edinburgh folk could and did speak a form of the "Doric," and that Scott himself spent the impressionable years of his childhood in the country districts of Roxburgh and Selkirk. And his dialect, even if not genuine, is mostly artfully managed. The natural comparison falls in the linking of Galt with Burns, both of whom were Ayrshire born and bred. Here, too, let it be noted that Burns's use of the vernacular is likewise marked by literary furbishing. A comparison of the folk speech of Burns, Galt, and Scott, with due respect to the fact that the dialect of the Tweed differs from that of the Nith, should be an absorbing piece of research. Here differences would turn out to be far more subtle than those separating Scott's world of chivalry and history from the homely record of Scotchmen wresting a hard living from an ungracious soil and an intemperate climate.

The reading of *The Gathering of the West* carries its own reward; but if it leads on to the reading of the *Annals of the Parish* and the *Ayrshire Legatees*, it redoubles the reward. Mr. Booth deserves our thanks for making accessible this story done up in the attractive format of the Johns Hopkins Press.

EDWARD GODFREY COX

University of Washington

Forces in American Criticism. By BERNARD SMITH. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1939. Pp. 401. \$3.00.

Mr. Smith is another member of that group of writers interested in the history of American culture who has been stimulated by V. L. Parrington's *Main Currents in American Thought*. In Mr. Smith's case this has led to a study of American literary criticism in its interrelationships with society. A work of this kind requires some guiding principle or theory, particularly at a time when the necessary spadework of literary scholarship is so incomplete as it is in the field of American literature. Otherwise there is no chance for an integrated interpretation and no way to fill in the blank spots not yet cleared up by detailed investigation.

In Mr. Smith's case this guiding theory is Marxian in the broadest and best sense of the word. More specifically, the author believes that the ideas men have regarding the values and purposes of litera-

ture are functions of their class and the relationships of that class to the whole of society. *Forces in American Criticism* is the clearest and most mature interpretation of its kind yet written.

The interpretation is at its best when it deals with the "genteel tradition" as exemplified in Henry James but it is also enlightening and provocative in its critical presentation of such figures as Walt Whitman and William Dean Howells. It is to Bernard Smith's credit that he made use of the researches available and pertinent to his study. It may be surprising to some students that so much of the yet limited scholarship in the American field is of significance for such purposes. Yet it follows that for these objectives a history of McGuffey's Readers is of more significance than Killis Campbell's studies of Poe's literary sources.

There are thin spots and even some blank spaces. The romantic criticism epitomized for Smith in Emerson, Thoreau, Margaret Fuller and William Gilmore Simms fails to exhibit the profusion, the complexities and the individual differences which it in reality possessed. The critical theories of the naturalists are neglected. It is true that there was no literary critic who voiced these theories, nevertheless naturalism was a known and influential point of view and previously Mr. Smith had not hesitated to discuss criticism implicit or scattered throughout other writings as in the cases of Thoreau and Walt Whitman. Theodore Dreiser certainly gave expression to the naturalistic credo in some of his essays. The contemporary critics dealt with are so numerous in comparison with those treated in the earlier periods that a misleading impression is created. True, literary criticism has proliferated in the last few decades but part of the disparity is due to a more rigid selection and less detailed knowledge about the past than the present.

No one can overlook the pioneer work done by Mr. Smith. His treatment of the academic literary historians and critics is necessarily sketchy since this is the first attempt to place them in their relations to the stream of literary criticism. The discussion of Henry Adams as a literary critic has not been done before, the critical work of Charles Brockden Brown and Joseph Dennie has been previously neglected by the literary historian although they have been subjects of study by scholars. The literary criticism of Simms has been literally resurrected. Even more noteworthy is Smith's examination and discussion of the literary judgments exhibited in important magazines of each period. These accomplishments in themselves would make *Forces in American Criticism* of value to the scholar.

Some readers may be surprised that a history of American literary theory, Marxian in point of view, can still relate its judgments to considerations of historical time, place and personality or see the enduring values in literary work that such an author would regard as historically outmoded. An intelligent and well-grounded work, Bernard Smith's *Forces in American Criticism* demonstrates the potentialities of such an interpretation.

E. H. EBY

University of Washington

A Critical Bibliography of German Literature in English Translation 1481-1927, With Supplement Embracing the Years 1928-1935.

By BAYARD QUINCY MORGAN. Second Edition, Completely Revised and Greatly Augmented. California: Stanford University Press, 1938. Pp. 773. \$10.00.

To the above description we may add the statement that the first edition, published at Madison, Wisconsin, in 1922, covered the period 1509-1917. The earliest entry in the first edition was Alexander Barclay's edition of Brant's *Narrenschiff*. In the new edition the earliest entry is Caxton's translation of *Reineke Fuchs*, for the inclusion of which some defence is offered on page 568.

"Ihrer Natur nach können Bücher dieser Art erst gut werden bei der zweiten Auflage" (Jacob Grimm to Karl Weygand, Dec. 21, 1867); but when can they become perfect? As Morgan admits at the beginning of his new preface—as indeed any other bibliographer would admit—"never." Nevertheless they do approach perfection at the same doughty, tragic pace with which variables are supposed to approach a limit, only to miss it at last by a hair. In such a process the first advance is the most decided one. Still speaking mathematically, we may report Morgan's estimate that the number of his total entries is now increased by about 50 per cent. Part of the increase is accounted for by the lengthened span of years surveyed, but most of it is accomplished by inner growth. The 1922 edition, for example, had sixty-six entries under Heine, the 1938 edition has 110. The earlier edition had sixty-three cross references to Heine in collections, the new edition has 118.

More important, however, is the qualitative superiority of the new edition. The most appreciated innovation is the listing of all translations under their original titles wherever ascertainable. Next in importance is the more intensive analysis of the content of selections. The earlier edition overlooked one or two minor routine sources of information. It is improbable that the new edition has done so, but some items will always escape even the most perfect routine. I have in my meagre library for example a somewhat prized book called *German Lyric Poetry* by Norman Macleod, Hogarth lecture No. 13, London, 1930. No one would know by its title that it is a collection of new translations with a running commentary, but it is just that. Had it been included it would certainly have escaped Morgan's dagger and might even have touched his stars. Translations from magazines, Morgan says, are included wherever found. More could not be justly demanded. As minor curiosities I might refer to translations of the poems on Inkle and Yarico by Gellert and by Gessner, in the *Weekly Magazine or Edinburgh Amusement*, XIV (1771), 164-167, and 197-200.

The earlier edition served to call attention to the fact that certain important German novels and dramas of the past had never received their merited attention at the hands of English translators.

The new edition reveals the fact that there is still no English translation of Keller's *Der grüne Heinrich*, and that no further novels of Fontane have appeared in English. It tells much the same story regarding Grillparzer and Kleist, for unfortunately certain items appeared too late for inclusion. This applies to Kleist's *Der zerbrochene Krug*, translated by Krumpelmann, *Poet Lore*, XLV (1939), 146-209, and translations of Grillparzer's dramas by H. H. Stevens as follows: *Hero and Leander*, *King Ottokar*, *His Rise and Fall*, and *Thou Shalt Not Lie*, all published by The Register Press, Yarmouth Port, Mass., in 1938 and 1939.

The supplement for the years 1928-1935 shows, moreover, that the past continues to be neglected. Only a few resurrections can be found. We welcome the *Tieck-von Raumer Letters*, ed. Zeydel and Matenko, N. Y., 1930 (though they should not be counted, since they are not translations), and we welcome also the La Roche diary, *Sophie in London*, 1786, translated by Clare Williams, London, 1933. The letters of Lichtenberg, *Lichtenberg's Visits to England as Described in His Letters and Diaries*, translated by Ware and Quarrell, N. Y., 1938, is another work which was published too late for inclusion. The only German belletristic works of older date to make their appearance in English for the first time seem to be Hartmann von Aue's *Der grüne Heinrich* and Wernher der Gartenaere's *Meyer Helmbrecht*, both translated by C. H. Bell in his *Peasant Life in Old German Epics*, N. Y., 1931. Other works continue to challenge the readers to repeated translations. During the last eight years there were published eight new translations of Goethe's *Faust*.

In his introduction, Morgan offers us many interesting statistical observations on the basis of his compilation and invites us to make others of our own. I have only the following to offer concerning the period 1928-1935. The most frequently published author was J. Grimm. His *Kinder und Hausmärchen* has fifty-nine entries. Thereafter authors appear with the following total entries: R. Steiner, 47; J. Spyri, 24; E. Ludwig, 20; L. Feuchtwanger, 19; Goethe, 18; T. Mann, 17; J. Wyss, 17; J. Wassermann, 16; then come Schnitzler, Marx, and Leonhard Frank, each with 14. From this motley list one may draw conclusions according to wish.

Bibliographies of this nature begin to become antiquated on the day after the final proofs are in. Such works call for supplements at least once in ten years. Translators who elect to publish their works under misleading titles or in obscure journals ought to apprise Morgan of their acts in order that the next supplement may be more serviceable.

The new edition could not have been published without a subsidy from the Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation. It probably also could not but for the recent advances in the technique of book making. The new photolithic method will make possible the publication of other useful works of large compass, for which only a limited

market can be predicted. The pages are neatly typed and sufficiently agreeable to the eye after one has become accustomed to them. The bibliography proper will be used chiefly for purposes of reference. On the other hand the introductory pages, which misleadingly appear to be more closely spaced than the later ones, are full of statistical matters which one is tempted to pore over. Printed pages might have been afforded us here. Author and publisher have a right to hope that the older edition will be discarded and the new one established in its place.

LAWRENCE M. PRICE

University of California in Berkeley

Deutsche Dramatik der Gegenwart: Eine Einführung mit ausgewählten Textproben: Mit 12 Dichterbildnissen. Von DR. HERMANN WANDERSCHECK. Verlagshaus Bong & Co.: Berlin, 1939. Pp. viii+329. RM 5.40.

Wanderscheck's volume on the *Deutsche Dramatik der Gegenwart* is significant for its analysis of the state of the theater and drama before 1933, and for its comprehensive survey of dramatic efforts since that date. Also, the book contains a very informative encyclopedic section which deals with eighty-seven contemporary authors, presenting biographical data, lists of dramas, date and place of first production. A selected bibliography and an index add to the usefulness of the book.

To begin with, the Third Reich found the theater in ruins—"geistig und wirtschaftlich zertrümmert." The drama had ceased to exist as a form of art; for more than a hundred years it had divided its allegiance between the money lords and the political lords. Subservient to selfish liberalism, disintegrating individualism, international Marxism, and numerous foreign influences, it had lost all connection with the German Volk and with German life. Genuinely "German" dramatists had been unable to obtain a hearing. In short, "das deutsche Theater schien rettungslos verloren."

Then came the Third Reich. "Nichtkunst, Unkunst, Kunstersatz" were extinguished. The State assumed most of the economic risk. Certain injurious elements were removed. And now, Wanderscheck is able to present a "transformed" theater. It is again a "moral institution," expressing the will of the Volk.

Readers who have been acquainted with the German drama during the last quarter of a century will recognize Wanderscheck's black-and-white description of the two periods as consciously partisan. Further, most readers will be annoyed by frequent repetitions on the one hand and by not being able to follow the logic of certain deductions on the other. For example: Is the dramatist now under less obligation to his producer (=State=Party) than he was for-

merly? Nevertheless, the book is the best this reviewer has seen in this field.

Wanderscheck pays homage to the forerunners of the Third Reich dramaturgy. The greatest of the forerunners was Paul Ernst, who—not properly appreciated in the *Zwischenreich*—has now come into his own (p. 46). His followers, including Dr. Rainer Schlösser, the Reich's official dramatic critic, sponsor his opinion that Sophocles' treatment of the Oedipus problem is the "most impelling demonstration of the efforts of the nordic, and especially of the Germanic, mind to arrive at the secret of the tragical" (p. 26).

The second of the great pioneers was Dietrich Eckart, whose satirical and historical plays had little success during his lifetime (d. 1924) and immediately after, but which are now a regular part of the national repertoire. The great Third Reich theater at Bochum is named in his honor. Others devoutly praised as forerunners of the new drama include Hanns Johst, Erwin Guido Kolbenheyer, Hermann Burte, Emil Strauss, Joachim von der Goltz, and Otto Erler.

There is great activity in the German theater, with approximately three hundred new plays being presented annually. The chapter titles of the book under discussion indicate something of the variety of the plays: "Dramatik aus dem Fronterlebnis," "Das politische Drama," "Das geschichtliche Drama, Historisches Schauspiel und Historienstück," "Das Bauerndrama," "Komödie und Lustspiel," "Das Volksstück," and "Das völkische Spiel."

Major efforts seem to center about three problems: the regaining of a technique for the tragical, the revaluation of the nation's history, and the development of the political drama. Wherever he works, "der Dramatiker ist ein politischer Mensch durch und durch" (p. 18). The political drama came into full display, according to Wanderscheck (p. 10), during the National Theater Week in 1936 with the production of works by Hanns Johst, Friedrich Bethge and Eberhard Wolfgang Möller.

The limited statistics concerning productions from 1933 to 1938 (p. 158) are illuminating. The five most played authors were: Hanns Johst, in 183 theaters with 1337 presentations; Eberhard Wolfgang Möller, in 86 theaters with 437 presentations; Paul Ernst, in 46 theaters with 383 presentations; and Curt Langenbeck, in 25 theaters with 83 presentations.

Students of the interchange of American-German influences will want to take note of some of the plays affecting the above figures. Johst's record was largely due to his *Thomas Paine*. Möller had previously presented *Kalifornische Tragödie* and *Panamaskandal* (of the French Company). Bethge owed no small part of his success to his *Marsch der Veteranen*, which took its cue from the bonus marchers in Washington. Langenbeck's next piece was to be *Hochverräter*, out of the early history of the New York colony.

Incidentally, Ernst's success during these years resulted largely from Möller's espousal of *Pantolon und seine Söhne*, a comedy set in an Italian milieu, written in 1916 but not staged before 1933.

It is most interesting to note that the contemporary German dramatist does not often find his subject matter in contemporary German history. If the topic is German, it is likely to be from not-too-recent history. The social drama has quite disappeared.

Wanderscheck makes the best possible case for his dramatists. At some length he explains their aspirations and their feelings in respect to the drama—feelings, rather than theories. He is very clever in discovering a few soft spots in their work, but—like a sympathetic physician—he does not probe too deeply and assures that the next will be better.

Our author, who is engaged in editorial work for the Party, has previously published a *Bibliographie zur englischen Propaganda im Weltkrieg*, 1935, and a treatise on the *Weltkrieg und Propaganda*, 1936.

EDMUND E. MILLER

University of Maryland

Three Old French Chronicles of the Crusades (The History of the Holy War, The History of them that took Constantinople, The Chronicle of Reims). Translated into English by EDWARD NOBLE STONE. Seattle: University of Washington Publications in Social Sciences, X, 1939. Pp. 377. \$3.50.

The Conquest of Constantinople. Translated from the Old French of Robert of Clari, by EDGAR HOLMES McNEAL. New York: Columbia University Press, 1936. Pp. 150. \$2.75.

Professor Stone's volume comprises English renditions of *L'Estoire de la Guerre Sainte* by Ambrose, a history of the Third Crusade; *Estoires de chiaus qui conquist Constantinoble* by Robert de Clari, a story of the Fourth Crusade; and the anonymous *Chronique de Rains*, known also as *Récits d'un ménestrel de Reims*, a sort of universal chronicle, but concerned principally with France and the crusades.

The translations, like the originals, are intended for the casual reader. Hence the critical apparatus, while adequate for the scholar, presents the results but not the processes of painstaking research, and never distracts the attention from the progress of the narrative. Brief forewords to each section contain the necessary information concerning the nature and date of the text translated, the author, and the significance of the work.

Ambrose, for example, writing in 1195 or 1196, was a jongleur in the service of Richard Cœur de Lion, and hence an eyewitness of many of the incidents of the Third Crusade. His book, *Estoire de la Guerre Sainte*, whose octosyllabic couplets abound in rime tags, homophony, and redundancy, possesses nonetheless the distinction of being the oldest historical work in the French language dealing with contemporaneous events.

Robert of Clari, characterized only by modest mentions of himself in his history, dictated his account, possibly to his brother Aleaume, about 1216. He served, as did Villehardouin, through the whole of the Fourth Crusade; but his report is the quaint narrative of a plain soldier, unaware of the political intrigues with which Villehardouin's account is largely occupied. For the historian, however, it possesses the value which would inhere in the memoirs of one of Xenophon's "Ten Thousand" or of a centurion in the Gallic War; while to the lover of adventure tales it presents "a long succession of engaging episodes, some tragic, some (perhaps unintentionally) very comical" (p. 163).

The author of the *Chronique de Rains* (1260) is portrayed, not as a serious historian, but as a minstrel who chose instead of the avowedly fictitious repertoire of his fellows, an account based on gossip and tradition, forming a chronicle, discursive but interesting and entertaining, for the edification of the wealthy burghers and nobles. Professor Stone defends the anonymous author from charges of unscrupulous deceit by comparing his method with that of Suetonius, who is quite generally respected as a historian, and by noting its verbatim citation as an authentic source in Masson's *Medieval France*. The translator prefers, however, to classify his subject as the first writer of historical romance, a painter, not a photographer, of history, and comparable in modern times to Walter Scott. He recommends him for the charm of his style, his mastery of the art of narration, and the ever fresh variety and vividness of his pictures of thirteenth century life. However, for the benefit of "those, who, dreading the contagion of historical error," refuse to heed this advice, Professor Stone appends an abridgement of De Wailly's critical study as a "sort of mental antiseptic" (pp. 251-252).

These introductory sketches are sufficient to indicate that as isolated examples of medieval narratives the three works possess inherent interest. Presented together they reveal a certain unity, also; for all three represent the viewpoint of the common man, in contrast with that of the nobles and leaders depicted in the classic accounts by Villehardouin and Joinville.

Explanatory notes provide an illuminating commentary on the translation. They contain indications of defects in the text, moot points of translation, and inconsistencies of the narratives, as well as etymological information of assistance in the interpretation of linguistic puzzles. Frequent elucidation of Arabic expressions reveals a particular interest of the translator. Historical, archeological, geo-

graphical, and literary investigations have served to identify characters, dates, events, and allusions. That the problem of historicity is not neglected is evidenced by comparisons of identical incidents in other authorities. In addition to positive contributions, the commentaries note obscure passages, unsolved references, and unidentified personages. Factual compendia are occasionally brightened by the whimsical observations of the commentator. Finally, to render appreciation complete, there is even an explanation of the Doge's pun (p. 242).

An index concludes the critical apparatus of the volume.

In a prefatory statement, Professor Stone expresses his principles of translation as the attempt to "present to the modern English reader a version that will give him, in some degree, the same set of impressions that an educated Frenchman of the present day receives from a perusal of the original." In fact, the translation is characterized by a sustained tone of archaism throughout, even to the reproduction of some of the tortuously involved sentences of the original; and its beauty is frequently enhanced by a cadenced repetition which probably surpasses the artistry of the Old French version.

Independent but coincidental with Professor Stone's translation of Robert de Clari's *Chronicle* is one by Edgar Holmes McNeal of Ohio State University. Its inclusion in the "Records of Civilization" series sponsored by the Columbia University Department of History accounts, however, for a difference of treatment and emphasis. Noting that the French text was edited by Lauer for "*Les Classiques français du moyen-âge*," a collection designed primarily for students of language and literature, and consequently equipped with a minimum of historical critical apparatus, McNeal declares his intention of providing a somewhat fuller setting of the *Chronicle* than that of the Lauer edition (and, incidentally, of the Stone translation).

McNeal's introductory commentary, then, while it traces the manuscript and its transmission and does not disregard literary qualities, is essentially a critical historical study which seeks to evaluate Robert's sources of information and his reliability as an authority. Concerning Robert's sources, McNeal concludes that he related events in which he participated, relying on observation, half-information, and conjecture, supplemented by official proclamations. Robert's credibility is adduced by an examination of internal evidence checked by a comparison of accounts common to his and other statements. McNeal believes the assumption warranted that the story was written by the scribe essentially as Robert dictated it; that the soldier-author's prejudices are only those of his race, age, and station; that the only animosity expressed is upon the occasion of the unfair division of spoils; and that investigation discloses no evidence of self-glorification or other ulterior motive for falsification. This assumption of reliability is strengthened by a comparison of the discussion of the diversion of the expedition to Constantinople

as it appears in Robert's *Chronicle*, in Villehardouin, and in Hugh de Saint-Pol. The probable sources and reliability of two interpolated episodes receive the attention of the commentator. He notes in passing, also, the recurrence a generation later of the Guy de Lusignan digression in the *Récits d'un ménestrel de Reims*. The archeological value of Robert's work is acknowledged and illustrated by his unique description of Constantinople, and by his observations of military and naval warfare.

Explanatory notes provide a careful commentary on diplomatic and political history, archeology, and geography, as well as parallels with and significant departures from other contemporary treatments. The commentator defends his decisions regarding controversial issues by citing authorities, or by developing in detail the reasoning processes which led him to his conclusions. Illustrative and confirmatory material is quoted from an extensive array of medieval authors. Factual notes correspond and agree with Professor Stone's, but again with a shift of focus; while the classicist is indefatigable in identifying the catalogue of kings, bishops, barons, rich men who bore banners, rich men who performed prodigious deeds of valor, and even one "poor man," the historian stresses principally problems of authenticity and documentation.

The identity of the author is discussed by McNeal with reference to two autobiographical statements in the *Chronicle*, and to evidence in other contemporary accounts, including legal documents relating to the family (p. 4). A brief literary criticism of the piece remarks the simplicity of style and paucity of vocabulary which place it only a step beyond oral report, but attests its importance as an early stage in the development of French prose, and an evidence of interest in history on the part of feudal society.

The translator describes his method as a literal rendition except that occasional meaningless repetitions are suppressed and purposeless tense shifts are disregarded. The simple style and meager vocabulary of the original are imitated in the English version. Textual notes indicate repetitions, omissions, misreadings, and blanks where these affect the translation.

An appendix compares statistical accounts of ships, men and horses, and of division of spoils as listed in Villehardouin, the anonymous *Devastatio*, and Hugh de Saint-Pol, and adds archeological information about types of ships gleaned from indicated authorities. A complete and well arranged bibliography divided into sources (editions and translations) and authorities, and an index conclude this admirable study.

LURLINE V. SIMPSON

University of Washington

The Effect of Stress Upon Quantity in Dissyllables. By NORMAN E. ELIASON and ROLAND C. DAVIS. Bloomington: Indiana University Publications, Science Series, No. 8, 1939. Pp. 56. \$1.00.

This monograph is more than a study of the influence of stress on quantity. It does, indeed, make a useful contribution to our knowledge of the duration of speech sounds, but its greater significance lies in the direction and method of the research. Eliason and Davis have made one of the few attempts to correlate historical and experimental approaches in phonetic investigation.

It is well known, of course, that no less than four rather distinct bodies of material co-exist under the title "phonetics." The most common of these, at least to the layman, consists of the physiological descriptions of speech sounds which are the stock-in-trade of many current text-books. At the research level this aspect of the science probably has taken its most forward step in the long line of x-ray studies carried on by such men as Gutzmann, Panconcelli-Calzia, Tomas, Holbrook, Russell, Parmenter, and Treviño. The second body of phonetic material is the "experimental," meaning that which is derived from laboratory analysis of sound waves after the manner of the physicist. This is the aspect of phonetics made significant by the work of such men as Köenig, Miller, Paget, Scripture, Crandall, and Fletcher—to name only a few of the prominent contributors. The third aspect of phonetics is that part of the history of language which deals with phonological changes. Here is the oldest and most academic contribution to the subject, distinguished by such names as Grimm, Meyer, Jespersen, Krapp, Kenyon and the group of men, headed by Hans Kurath, now at work on the *Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada*. Finally, there is applied phonetics which is an attempt to refine and clarify the stream of utterance. The workers in this aspect of the field are for the most part teachers, those who battle against slovenly vernacular as well as those who advocate a highly refined and cultivated standard of pronunciation.

To speak of these diverse contributions to linguistic study as within the same subject field may seem an idle speculation because they are now so largely separate. Eliason and Davis point out this fact clearly in their introduction to the present monograph when they describe the mutual distrust with which historical linguists and experimental phoneticians regard each other's work. The picture of diversity could, in fact, be enlarged. Both these groups, including Eliason and Davis themselves, question the value of physiological descriptions of speech sounds; and physiological phoneticians often ignore in whole or in part the findings of philologists and experimentalists. Finally and most regrettably, some teachers of voice and diction are going about their task of improving utterance with but slight reference to the linguistic and historical materials avail-

able to them. Such work is bad pedagogy as well as pseudo-science. Probably a sustained and enthusiastic coördination of effort among all those workers who deal with any aspect of phonetics would do more to advance the science than any other single step which might be taken.

This situation and this need give special importance to the monograph now before us. In a field whose various aspects have developed more or less independently, the authors demonstrate a practical method of "bringing together the allied fields of historical phonology and experimental phonetics." Possibly they would not agree that all four aspects of phonetics could be correlated. They point out that we cannot now assume any consistent relation between physiological formation and physical properties of speech sounds; and, in fact, doubt the value of physiological description of sounds as represented by E. A. Meyer's work (*Englische Lautdauer*) and of kymograph records generally. Nevertheless they have pointed out the need for coördination of materials and techniques, and have demonstrated a method for such coordination in terms of a specific problem:

The Problem: Does variation in stress upon the second syllable of a dissyllabic containing a single intervocalic consonant affect the quantity of the preceding sounds?

The Method: By means of an electro-acoustic system the experimenters made graphic records of 151 pronunciations by 21 different speakers of eight dissyllabic nonsense words having a single intervocalic consonant. Since the experimenters found that "quantitative variation in a stressed vowel due to a change in phonetic environment is . . . the same in vowels of different quality," they based their results on analysis of 68 records of *tooten* [tutən] and 55 records of *tooty* [tutɪ].

The Results: Stress level difference—i.e., concentration of stress on the first syllable and reduction of it on the second—was found to be the chief factor affecting length of the vowel [u] medial [t] explosion, and the final syllable [ən].

To this reviewer the methods and conclusions of the study seem reasonably sound. The main deficiency, as the authors themselves recognize, is that only two nonsense words were studied with any completeness. Full confirmation of the findings must wait upon analysis of many sound combinations in recognized as well as nonsense words. But whether the detailed conclusions of Eliason and Davis are eventually modified or rejected, they have exemplified a type and direction of research whose fundamental usefulness seems unquestionable. The coördination of experimental and historical material is a progressive step. Perhaps it is not too optimistic to hope that extension of the method by other workers may eventually result in the discovery of more constant relations between physiological and physical properties of speech sounds than are now known.

HORACE G. RAHSKOPF

University of Washington

BOOKS RECEIVED

AMERICAN

- Kaplan, Estelle. *Philosophy in the Poetry of Edwin Arlington Robinson*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940. Pp. 162. \$2.25.
- Robinson, Edwin Arlington. *Selected Letters*. [Edited by Ridgely Torrence.] New York: Macmillan, 1940. Pp. vii+191. \$2.50.

ENGLISH

- Black, Frank Gees. *The Epistolary Novel in the Late Eighteenth Century: A Descriptive and Bibliographical Study*. Eugene: University of Oregon Monographs, Studies in Literature and Philology No. 2, April, 1940. Pp. iii+184. \$1.25.
- Bowers, F. T. *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy 1587-1642*. Princeton University Press, 1940. Pp. vii+284. \$3.00.
- Chaucer, G. *The Canterbury Tales*, text of. Studied on the basis of all known manuscripts by John M. Manly and Edith Rickert, with the aid of Mabel Dean, Helen McIntosh, and others, with a chapter on Illuminations by Margaret Rickert. University of Chicago Press, 1940. 8 vols. \$40.00 set.
- Hotchner, Cecilia A. *Wessex and Old English Poetry with Special Consideration of "The Ruin."* New York: Privately printed, 1939. Pp. iii+146.
- Kirby, T. A. *Chaucer's Troilus: A Study in Courtly Love*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Studies No. 39, 1940. Pp. 337. \$3.00.
- Reynolds, George Fullmer. *The Staging of Elizabethan Plays at the Red Bull Theatre, 1605-1625*. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1940. Pp. 203. \$2.00.
- Templeman, William D. *The Life and Work of William Gilpin*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1939. Pp. 336. \$3.00 paper; \$3.50 cloth.
- Workman, Samuel K. *Fifteenth Century Translation as an Influence on English Prose*. Princeton University Press, 1940. Pp. 210. \$2.00.

FRENCH

- Alden, Douglas W. *Marcel Proust and His French Critics*. Los Angeles: Lymanhouse, 1940. Pp. iii+259.
- Gide, Andre. *L'Evolution du Theatre*. Introduction and notes by Carl Wildman. University of Manchester Press, 1939. Pp. 37.
- Pope, M. K. *Studies Presented to*. University of Manchester Press, 1939. Pp. vii+429.
- Silin, Charles I. *Benserade and His Ballets de Cour*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. Pp. 435. \$4.00 paper; \$4.50 cloth.
- Taille, Jean de la. *De L'Art de la Tragedie*. Edited by Frederick West. University of Manchester Press, 1939. Pp. 37.
- Voltaire, F. *Poem sur la Loi Naturelle*. A critical edition by Francis J. Crowley. Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles Publications in Languages and Literatures, Vol. I, No. 4, 1938. Pp. 177-304.

GERMAN

- Bettex, A. W. *The German Novel of Today*. Cambridge, England: Bowes & Bowes, 1939. Pp. 46. 2s.
- Bithell, Jethro. *Modern German Literature 1880-1938*. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd. Pp. v+535. 21s.
- Francke, August Hermann. *Briefe an August Hermann Francke*. Edited by Theodor Geissendoerfer. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. Pp. 223. \$2.50 paper; \$3.00 cloth.
- Gray, Louis H. *Foundations of Language*. New York: Macmillan, 1939. Pp. xv+530. \$7.50.
- Merritt, Herbert Dean. *The Construction of ἀπό κοινοῦ in the Germanic Languages*. Stanford University Press, Vol. VI, No. 2 of *Language and Literature Series*, 1938. Pp. 114. \$1.25 paper; \$2.00 cloth.
- Schäfer, Wilhelm. *Die Anekdoten*. Edited by K.-W. Maurer. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1938. Pp. v+158.
- Schinnerer, Otto P. *Reading German*. New York: Macmillan, 1940. Pp. v+154. \$1.25.
- Taylor, Archer. *Problems in German Literary History of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1939. Pp. 211. \$2.00.
- Thomas, R. Hinton. *The Classical Ideal in German Literature (1755-1805)*. Cambridge, England: Bowes & Bowes, 1939. Pp. vii+126. 5s. net.
- Woolf, Henry Bosley. *The Old Germanic Principles of Name-Giving*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1939. Pp. 299+xii. \$4.00.

ITALIAN

- Silber, Gordon Rutledge. *The Influence of Dante and Petrarch on Certain of Boccaccio's Lyrics*. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Co., 1940. Pp. 162.
- Singleton, Charles S. *Nuovi Canti Carnascialeschi del Rinascimento*. Società Tipografica Modenese Editrice in Modena, 1940. Pp. 173.

SPANISH*

- Hilton, Ronald. *Campoamor, Spain, and the World*. University of Toronto Press, 1940. Pp. 152. \$1.50.
- Martinez, Alfonso de Toledo: *El Arcipreste De Talavera o sea El Corbacho de Alfonso Martinez de Toledo. Nuevamente editado segun el codice escorialense por Leslie Byrd Simpson*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Pp. xi+361.

GENERAL

- Chadwick, H. Munro, and Chadwick, N. Kershaw. *The Growth of Literature*. Cambridge University Press; New York: Macmillan. 3 vols. \$9.00 each; \$22.50 set.

*Books received which treat non-literary aspects of Latin-America will be found listed, and in many cases reviewed, in the *Revista Iberoamericano*.

THE JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY

Founded by Gustaf E. Karsten

A QUARTERLY DEVOTED TO THE ENGLISH, GERMAN,
AND SCANDINAVIAN LANGUAGES AND
LITERATURES

Manuscripts submitted for publication should be typewritten and addressed as follows: those in the field of English literature to H. S. V. JONES, 419 Lincoln Hall; in German to ALBERT W. ARON, 217 Lincoln Hall; in Scandinavian literature and in Germanic linguistics to GEORGE T. FLOM, 420 Lincoln Hall, Urbana, Illinois.

PUBLISHED by THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA, ILLINOIS, U. S. A.

Subscription Price \$4.00 a Volume; Single Numbers \$1.25

Address all business communications as follows:
H. E. CUNNINGHAM, Director, University of Illinois Press
358 Administration Building, Urbana, Illinois



REALITY AND THE POET IN SPANISH POETRY

By Pedro Salinas

This volume contains six lectures delivered on the Percy Graeme Turnbull Poetry Foundation of the Johns Hopkins University in 1937. Contents: I. The Reproduction of Reality: *The Poem of the Cid* and *A Ballad*; II. The Acceptance of Reality: Jorge Manrique and Calderón de la Barca; III. The Idealization of Reality: Garcilasso de la Vega; IV. The Escape from Reality: Fray Luis de León and San Juan de la Cruz; V. The Exaltation of Reality: Luis de Góngora; VI. The Revolt against Reality: José de Espronceda. Professor Salinas is a distinguished Spanish poet and was professor of Spanish language and literature in the Universities of Paris, Seville and Madrid, guest lecturer in Cambridge, Oxford and Brussels, visiting professor in Columbia and Wellesley, and recently appointed professor of Spanish literature in the Johns Hopkins University. Printed in English. 174 pages, \$2.00.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

Baltimore . Maryland

HISPANIC REVIEW

*A Quarterly Journal Devoted to Research in the Hispanic
Languages and Literatures*

Published by the University of Pennsylvania Press
Philadelphia

Founder, J. P. Wickersham Crawford

Editors, M. Romera-Navarro and Otis H. Green

Associate Editors

Milton A. Buchanan
Americo Castro
Alfred Coester
J. D. M. Ford

Joseph E. Gillet
Harry C. Heaton
Hayward Keniston

Sturgis E. Leavitt
S. Griswold Morley
Rudolph Schevill
Charles P. Wagner

Subscription price, \$4.00 a year; single issue, \$1.25

Address inquiries and orders to:

Professor Edwin B. Williams, Business Manager, College Hall,
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

MODERN PHILOLOGY

EDITORS

RONALD S. CRANE, *Managing Editor*

TOM PEETE CROSS

WILLIAM A. NITZE

E. PRESTON DARGAN

GEORGE T. NORTHUP

JAMES R. HULBERT

ROBERT VIGNERON

CONTENTS FOR MAY, 1940

Victorian Bibliography for 1939.....*William D. Templeman*

Ronsard and the Burning Grove.....*Robert Valentine Merrill*

The Witchcraft Basis of Marlowe's Faustus.....*Paul H. Kocher*

Textual Difficulties in the Interpretation of Donne's Poetry

George Williamson

Milton's Latin Poems.....*G. B. A. Fletcher*

Published quarterly in August, November, February, May.

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year . . . Single copies, \$1.25.

Canadian postage, 15 cents; foreign postage 55 cents.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois

A STANDARDIZED AMERICA?

The Southwest Review interprets the life
of a region: a rich texture of folklore and
contemporary economics, cotton and oil
and tobacco, mountain and plain, river
and desert, traditions of Old West and
Old South. . . .

part of the *authentic* America
infinitely various

Published quarterly

Two dollars a year

SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY

Dallas, Texas

